

THE
MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1853.

ART. 1.—THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON THE FAMILY.†

MARRIAGE, that universal, fundamental, moral relation, the nursery of the State and the Church, is, indeed, as old as humanity itself, and a strictly divine institution, (Gen. 2: 18.) But under the influence of sin it has degenerated, and Christianity alone restored it to its proper dignity and significance. Our religion places marriage in the most exalted light by representing it as a copy of the relation of Christ to his Church, thus giving it a truly holy, we may say, a sacramental character, (Eph. 5: 22, 23.)

By this comparison, in the first place, polygamy, which is found more or less not only in all heathen nations (most rarely in the Roman and Germanic,) but even amongst the Old Testament patriarchs and kings, and which has the sanction of law with Mohammedans, is forever condemned, and *monogamy* made the rule. This form of the conjugal relation was presented in the creation of the first human pair as the normal one; was made the ideal by the Mosaic law; and is the only condition of a true and truly happy marriage. Then again, in this analogy is implied the indissoluble nature of the marriage bond; for the union between Christ and his bride, the Church, can never be broken. The husband and the wife are one flesh; and what God has joined together, man must not put asunder, (comp. Math. 19: 3-9. 1 Cor. 7: 10.) Increase of immorality always goes hand in hand with the facilitating of divorce.

†From the work now in press: "History of the Apostolic Church." By Proff. Ph. Schaff, translated by Edw. D. Yeomans, A. M., New York: Charles Scribner.

Again, Christianity alone raises *woman* to her true dignity. It is well known, that in antiquity, even among the highly cultivated Greeks, woman was generally looked upon as a mere tool of lust, and therefore, in the most degraded light. Her education was shamefully neglected; and if she sometimes attained prominence in society, it was wholly in consequence of bodily attraction and the gift of entertaining wit, not for any moral force or purity of character. Even Plato, with all his exalted ideas, knew nothing of the sacredness of monogamy. In his ideal state he allows promiscuous concubinage. And in the ethical works of Aristotle, among many virtues, chastity and mercy, those pillars of genuine morality, are never mentioned. Sophocles, in his pious child-like, devoted, self-denying sufferer, Antigone, who followed her blind father into exile and sought in every way to alleviate his misfortunes, reaches out prophetically beyond the domain of Heathenism. Antigone is an ideal creation of poetic fancy, realized only in Christian nations. In reverence for the marriage relation the ancient Germans stood highest. They distinguished themselves above all other pagans by their great regard for the female sex, their chastity and conjugal fidelity; and these traits among others especially, predisposed them for the gospel. Yet these become most firm and sacred only by being referred to the holiest of all conceivable relations. Christianity does not, indeed, take woman out of her natural sphere of subordination and domestic life, and throw her into the whirl of public activity, from which she instinctively shrinks; but places her in a religious and moral point of view by the side of man, as a joint heir of the same heavenly inheritance, (1 Pet. 3: 7;) and by doctrine and illustrious example, as in the ever Blessed Virgin; in Salome, Martha and Mary, and Mary Magdalene, it has opened the way for the development of the noblest and loveliest female virtues in all their forms.

Finally, from that fruitful analogy may be derived all the duties of husband and wife to one another and to their children, as Paul himself presents them in few but comprehensive words in the passage cited above.

1. The relation of the *husband* to the wife is the same as that of Christ to the Church. In other words, the husband is even by virtue of his whole physical and intellectual constitution the head of the wife, her lord and ruler, (Eph. 5: 22.) He is not, however, to lord it over her ambitiously and arbitrarily, as a despot, but with the power of love, surrendering himself to her, as a part of his own being, as his other self,

making her partaker of all his joys and possessions, patiently and meekly bearing her weaknesses, promoting in every way her temporal, and above all, her spiritual welfare, and sacrificing himself for her, even to his last breath, as Christ has given His life for the Church, is continually purifying and sanctifying her with his blood, and raising her, as a spotless, richly adorned bride, to full participation in his glory and blessedness.* This, then, makes the sanctification and moral perfection of the character the highest end of conjugal life, to which the physical object, the propagation of the race, must be subordinate and subservient,†—a view, of which heathendom never dreamed. Of course, however, the devotion of the husband and wife to each other, as well as to the children, ought never to be absolute, or it would degenerate into idolatry. It should not interfere in the least either with the moral duties of public life and occupation, by neglect of which the most ardent conjugal love must only shrink morbidly into itself and wither, nor with the demands of love to God, who alone can claim our undivided heart and life. On the contrary it should favor both. When there is any danger of a conflict here, then the command is of force: "Let them, that have wives, be as though they had none," (1 Cor. 7: 29.)

2. The wife stands related to the husband, as the Church to the Lord; that is, she is to be subject to him, and to show him all due reverence.‡ But this obedience does not exclude equality of personal and moral dignity.§ It should have nothing slavish or bitter about it, no fear nor trembling. It should be free and joyful, in, and for the sake of, the Lord. (Comp. Col. 3: 18.) So the Church finds her highest honor, delight, and freedom in everywhere following her heavenly bridegroom in the most trustful self-resignation. Pride is contrary to the nature of woman, except so far as it relates to her husband and children, in whom she forgets herself. In this subordinate position, as well as in the maternal care of her children and the whole field of private, domestic life, she has occasion to exhibit her silent moral elevation, to unfold the noble virtues of modesty, meekness, patience, fidelity, and self-denial, and

*Eph. 5: 25-31. Col. 3: 19. 1 Pet. 3: 7.

†Schleiermacher strikingly says (*Predigten*, I. p. 575:) "The higher end of Christian marriage is, that each party may sanctify, and be sanctified by, the other;" and Rothe (*Theol. Ethik*, III, p. 670:) "Only in the holiness of self-denying love can the marriage relation be a copy of the relation of Christ to humanity, which he, by his self-devotion, has purchased for his own."

‡Eph. 5: 21, 33. 1 Cor. 11: 7 sqq. 1 Tim. 2: 11 sqq. 1 Pet. 3: 1 sqq.

§Gal. 3: 28. 1 Pet. 3: 7.

thereby to adorn her Christian profession, and to integrate the masculine character. Here too, however, the analogy is not perfect. For while the wife often converts her husband, and always ought at least to exert upon him a softening, refining, elevating and sanctifying influence, such an influence of the Church on Christ, the Perfect, is of course unnecessary and impossible.

3. The relation of *parents* to children corresponds with that of Christ and the Church to individual Christians; the father here again holding the place of Christ, the mother the place of the Church. Every new spiritual birth is the result of the creative activity of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Christian Church; and it is the Church, which by the faithful administration of the means of grace under the direction and with the power of the Lord nourishes, strengthens, and perpetually sustains the new life of her children, and protects it from all disease and degeneracy, till it reach the age of independent manhood in Christ. So should it be, also, in every Christian family. It is the duty primarily of the mother, who is peculiarly fitted for it by nature, to provide for the wants of the infant, and to awaken its slumbering powers to the first stage of their activity; but this she is to do under the oversight, and supported by the authority, of the father, who is king and priest in the sanctuary of his own house. Both parents are to treat their children not with severity, but with devoted, self-sacrificing love,* and to train them up not only for useful members of the body politic, but above all for citizens of the kingdom of heaven. They are to train them by instruction, and still more by the living power of example; by actually bearing witness of Christianity in their lives, and by the religious consecration of the whole domestic system; ever mindful that God has given them this precious blessing of marriage, and will one day call them to account for their use of it. This sacred duty the apostle enforces in the few words, Eph. 6: 4: "Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord;"† that is, as the representatives of the Lord, so that, properly speaking, the Lord himself, by the free agency of the parents, with earnestness and gentleness trains the children for himself, as his own. The apostle is here speaking, indeed, primarily only to fathers, as the responsible agents in the education of

*Eph. 6: 4. Col. 3: 21.

†Not "to the Lord," Zum Hern, as Luther translates it, which alters the sense materially.

the children; but he certainly would not exclude the delicate, noiseless, but none the less important part of the mother, who, by her meekness, patience, and fidelity, happily softens the sternness of the father's authority, (though without the latter she untrains instead of training;) and who, especially where her husband is not a believer, may and should exercise an exceedingly deep, lasting and salutary influence on the moral and religious character of the children; an influence which Paul himself recognizes in the mother and grandmother of Timothy.*

4. The first duty of *children*, as derived from what has now been said, is of course piety, reverential obedience.† This again is not to be slavish, but cheerful, the obedience of unreserved confidence and grateful love. It is also in the course of nature the first form of all piety towards God and reverence for divine things. For in its parents the child sees the representative of God, the reflection of His majesty and love, nay, we may say, God himself, so far as the child is able to comprehend Him. Where this course, which even natural right and the first commandment of the second table point out, is forsaken, there inevitably results wildness, slavery, and curse. Obedience to the divinely ordained authority of parents forms the only true training for real freedom and manly independence. All those carnal schemes of emancipation, whether relating to women or children, accomplish just the opposite of what they propose, and will have bitterly to repent their subversion of the natural and revealed order of things. It is worthy of remark, that the apostle makes the children of believing parents an organic part of the Christian congregation in requiring of them obedience "in the Lord;" thus supplying the purest motive for obedience, and at the same time duly restricting it. For as parental authority is derived from Christ and is to be exercised for him, it can only claim obedience, where it answers His spirit and will. When, therefore, it commands what is wrong, it comes into manifest conflict with its author, and destroys itself. Then applies our Lord's language, Math. 10: 37: "He that loveth father or mother more

*2 Tim. 1: 5. Comp. 1 Tim. 2: 15; 5: 10, 14, where the bearing children, *τεκνογονία*, certainly includes educating them. Woman finds her highest dignity and purest happiness, not merely in being a mother, but also in fulfilling all the duties of a mother in the Lord and for his glory. Human life should be propagated only to be educated for the great end of mankind, for virtue and religion.

†Eph. 6: 1-3. Col. 3: 20.

than me, is not worthy of me."* When the children pass out of their minority, they cease to obey in the strictest sense, and enter the relation of friendship; but never should they lose the reverence which is due in fact to old age in general,† and the gratitude, which rejoices to render to parents like for like, (1 Tim. 5; 4, 8,) and embalms them even after their death in imperishable memory.

Even without any express New Testament command,‡ it is easy to see, that the proper shaping of Christian domestic life, and especially the successful performance of duty as to the religious education of children, require the *family altar*, on which the father, as priest, may daily offer the sacrifice of thanksgiving and intercession. Family worship, with morning and evening prayer and use of the Holy Scriptures, includes also prayer at table. We are not to enjoy God's gifts of nature thoughtlessly like the beast of the field, but "with thanksgiving."§ In individual cases, however, it is hard to maintain this family worship properly, without the assistance of liturgies and hymn books. And great watchfulness is necessary, lest it degenerate into soul-less mechanism, into an *opus operatum*, or infringe upon the duty of closet prayer, the unseen personal intercourse of the soul with God. But that this danger is not always sufficiently avoided, can be no reason for questioning the duty of family worship itself, or asserting, that it is made superfluous by public worship. On the contrary we shall always find, that the two require and promote one another, and that, where the former dies, the latter also decays.|| For as marriage continually replenishes the State and secures its perpetuity, so personal and domestic piety furnishes the Church a constant supply of her best material.

Thus, therefore, are all the natural relations of authority and subordination recognized and confirmed by Christianity, and duly regulated, defined, and sanctified by being referred to the Lord and his Church; and thus is the whole family life consecrated as a nursery of the purest virtues, as a miniature theocracy, rooted, indeed, in the soil of nature, in the sexual love of individuals, but rising into heaven.

*Comp. Math. 8: 21, 22. Luke 2: 49. John 2: 4. Math. 12: 46-50.

†1 Pet. 5: 5. 1 Tim. 5: 1, 2.

‡Comp., however, Eph. 5: 19. Col. 3: 16.

§1 Cor. 10: 30, 31. 1 Tim. 4: 3-5.

||There is no doubt, that the regular and general attendance upon public worship, by which the English, Scotch, and Americans are so distinguished above other nations, is especially owing to their high regard for family worship.

Christianity then, as we meet it in the New Testament, recognizes in marriage the normal relation, in which the human character fully develops itself and answers its great end,—a relation instituted by God and sanctified by Christ. The depreciation of conjugal life by an asceticism, which cannot rise above its physical and natural basis to the view of its higher moral and religious significance, contradicts the spirit of the gospel, and is, in reality, of heathen origin.* In fact the apostle numbers it among the doctrines of the evil spirits, which rule the world of idolatry (1 Tim. 4: 1 sqq.) that they forbid marriage, as some Gnostic sects and the Manicheans did,—looking on the body, which was created by God and designed for the organ of the Holy Ghost, with its sensual wants, as a part of the intrinsically evil matter, and consequently regarding all contact with it as sinful.

*The defective, sensual conception of marriage among the heathen could produce both, great unchastity, polygamy, concubinage, &c., on the one side, and the ascetic contempt of the relation, on the other. For wherever moral earnestness was once awakened, instead of sanctifying this relation, it turned with horror from it. In its ideal of a priest, therefore, it usually includes, in some form, the conception of celibacy. So the ancient Indians, in the remarkable myth given by Creuzer in his *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker*, I, p. 407, 3d. ed. After Birmah had formed from his mouth, his arm, his leg, and his foot, the four patriarchs of the four castes, and had given wives to all, except the eldest, Brahman, the progenitor of the priests, the latter complained of his solitude; whereupon he received the answer: "He should not be distracted, (marriage is thus necessarily distraction,) but give himself up to doctrine, prayer, and worship." He persevering, however, in his request, Birmah, in anger, gave him one *Daintany*, a daughter of the giant family of *Daints*, and from this unequal match sprang the whole sacerdotal caste of the Brahmins. Among the Greeks the highest priest of the Eleusinian mysteries, the prophet or mystagogue, was forbidden to marry after assuming the office, and if he already had a wife, he must abstain from commerce with her. In the Roman religion the virgin priestesses of Vesta are familiar. The Gnostic and Manichean contempt of marriage springs from pagan views, and rests on a fundamentally wrong conception of matter and body. With the Jews (except the sect of Essenes, whose asceticism, however, was affected by foreign, oriental elements) a fruitful marriage stood, as is well known, in high esteem, and passed for a special divine blessing; while celibacy or barrenness was considered a reproach, particularly for women, or a divine visitation of punishment, (Gen. 16: 2-14. 19: 30-36. 1 Sam. 1: 6-11. Ps. 127: 3-5. 128: 3-6. Is. 4: 1. 47: 8, 9. Hos. 9: 14. Luke. 1: 26, 36.) The priests, and even the high priests, were, therefore, all married, yet during their term of service in the temple they were required to abstain from cohabitation. The high estimate of virginity, which came to prevail so early in the Christian Church, cannot be derived from Jewish ideas, and certainly as little from heathenism. It arose, no doubt, from ardent enthusiasm for the kingdom of God, which could very easily take up many vitiating elements and influences from the low pagan notion of marriage; especially as the conception of Christian marriage was so seldom fully realized; for this required a long process of civilization.

In this point Christ cannot be strictly taken as our pattern; for he was not merely an individual, but at the same time the *universal* man, for whom no suitable consort at all, of equal birth, could be found. The Church, the body of regenerate humanity, and it alone, (not the individual soul,) is his bride; and this relation is assuredly, as already shown, the sacred model of every true marriage.

As to the apostles, we know for a certainty, that Peter was married, and took his wife with him on his missionary tours.* Tradition affirms the same of Philip, and gives him, as well as Peter, children.† From 1 Cor. 9: 5, it has been justly inferred, that at least the majority of the apostles and brothers of the Lord, (probably sons of Joseph from his former marriage,) lived in wedlock.‡ At all events, Paul here excepts none but himself and Barnabas, while claiming the same right of marriage for himself, if he chose to make use of it.§ Yet ancient tradition unanimously represents St. John as unmarried.|| As

*Math. 8: 14, Luke 4: 38, where his mother-in-law is mentioned, and 1 Cor. 9: 5: "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brothers of the Lord, and Cephas?"

†Clement of Alexandria says of these two apostles, (*Strom.* III. p. 448) that they begat children; tradition speaks of a daughter of Peter by the name of Petronilla, (*Comp. Acta Sanct.*, 30th May;) and Polyocrates, bishop of Ephesus in the second century, in his letter to the Roman bishop, Victor, (*in Euseb. H. E.* III, 31, and V, 24,) mentions three daughters of the apostle Philip, of whom the first two died virgins in Hierapolis at an advanced age, and the third lay buried in Ephesus: Φιλίππου τὸν τῶν ἑξῆς ἀποστόλων, ὅς κεκοιμηται ἐν Ἱερὰπολιν καὶ δύο θυγατέρας αὐτοῦ, γαμηρακταὶ παρδίνου καὶ ἡ ἑτέρα αὐτοῦ θυγάτηρ ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πολιτευσάμενη. ἡ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἀναπαύεται. At the same place, (III. 31) Eusebius, on the authority of Proculus, speaks of "four prophesying daughters" of Philip, who were buried with their father in Hierapolis. But here it is plain from his remarks immediately following, that he confounds the apostle Philip with the deacon and evangelist of the same name, who according to Acts 21: 9, had four prophesying daughters, and when Paul last went to Jerusalem, was laboring in Caesarea in Palestine.

‡The deacon Hilary, A. D. 380, the probable author of the Commentary of Paul's Epistles, falsely ascribed to St. Ambrose and hence called *Ambrosiaster*, explicitly remarks on 1 Cor. 11: 2: "Omnes apostoli, exceptis Joanne et Paulo, uxores habuerunt."

§Hence some, though certainly without reason, (*Comp.* 1 Cor. 7: 7, 8,) held that Paul also was a husband or a widower. So Ignatius, *Ad Philad.* c. 4, according to the larger (spurious) recension: ὁ Πέτρον καὶ Παύλον, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀποστόλων, τῶν γὰρ οἱ προσομιλήσαντων. So Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* III, 7. ed. Potter.

||Hence he bears the standing title, παρδένος, παρδένιος, *virgo*. Augustine (*De dono conjugali*, 21,) mentions with respect as the views of many: "A Christo Joannem apostolum propterea plus amatum, quod neque uxorem duxerit, et ab ineunte pueritia castissimus vixerit." Hence also it is said in the chant for the festival of St. John in the Roman Church: "Diligebat eum Jesus, quoniam specialis praeerogativa castitatis, ampliori dilectione

to the subordinate officers of the Church, the book of Acts mentions four prophesying daughters of the deacon and evangelist, Philip, (21: 8, 9.) In 1 Tim. 3: 2, 12, Titus 1: 6, it is disputed indeed, whether successive or only simultaneous polygamy, polygamy proper, is forbidden. But at any rate the being "the husband of one wife," which is required of presbyters and deacons, as also the mention of their children and their own households, 1 Tim. 3: 4, 5, 11, 12, Titus 1: 6, imply that *one* marriage is right for ministers, and, so far from censuring the married state, present it as the normal state, and as a good school for exercise in the most important duties of life.

But if apostolic Christianity forbids no man marriage, as little does it enjoin it. On the contrary it presents exceptions from the general rule, and puts celibacy, if it be a voluntary act of self-denial for the kingdom of God, we cannot say, indeed, above the married state, yet very high, and attributes to it in several places a peculiar value.* There are men, who lack the qualifications for conjugal life, as the capacity to support a wife, individual sexual love, &c.; others, who, by some fault, whether their own or not, cannot fulfill the necessary conditions; others again, who feel called and bound to sacrifice all earthly love to heavenly, and to minister to the latter alone. Hence our Lord in the mysterious passage, Math. 19: 10-12, without, however, giving his disciples any command, speaks of three kinds of eunuchism, congenital, forced, and voluntary. Of course the latter alone is of any moral worth; voluntary self-denial for the sake of the kingdom of heaven; the willing renunciation of conjugal love and joys, the better to serve the general moral purpose of life. Such, we must suppose, was the course of Paul and Barnabas. For the for-

fecerat dignum: quia virgo electus ab ipso virgo in ævum permansit. In cruce denique moriturus huic matrem suam virginem virgini commendavit."

*Math. 19: 10-12. 1 Cor. 7: 7 sqq., 25 sqq. Rev. 14: 4. As to the latter passage it is a question indeed, whether by the hundred and forty-four thousand "*ἁγῶν*," which were not defiled with women, and which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth," are to be understood unmarried persons, or (as Bleek, *Beitrage zur Evangelienkritik*, p. 185, and De Wette, *ad loc.*, explain it) those, who have kept themselves free from all whoredom and unchastity, and from all contamination with idolatry. The first interpretation answers best to the literal meaning of the words, but has against it the vast number and the fact, that many of the most eminent servants of God, under both dispensations, from Abraham to Peter, who certainly belong also among the "first-fruits unto God and to the Lamb," were not *ἁγῶν* in the strict sense.

mer was certainly a man of strong natural feelings, of an ardent, passionate temperament, so that the renunciation of marriage was, in his case, an act of self-denial and moral heroism, for which he was strengthened by the assistance of divine grace. He represents it even as a charism, and notices the diversity of gifts in this respect, (1 Cor. 7: 7: 'Εκαστος ιδιον εχει χαρισμα εκ θεου.) Those, on the other hand, who have not the gift, to whom a life of celibacy would be such a perpetual struggle against natural propensities, as would prevent the quiet discharge of duty, he advises to marry (v. 9.). Such a celibacy, as cannot attain to the complete subjection of the bodily appetite, is assuredly of far less worth, than a virtuous marriage, in which also chastity may and should be preserved. To Paul, who spent his life in missionary travels, and was exposed to all possible privations, hardships, and persecutions, the married state, with its temporal cares and all sorts of personal matters of attention, must have seemed rather a hindrance to the fulfillment of his apostolic calling, and the single state, the *ενοουχιζειν εαυτον δια την βασιλειαν των ουρανων*, more favorable to his activity in the service of the Redeemer (v. 32-35.) With him celibacy was actually an elevation above all earthly cares, an entire devotion to the purest love and the holiest interests, an anticipation of the *vita angelica*.^{*} And who will deny, that such cases repeatedly occur? Who does not know, that the voluntary celibacy of so many self-denying missionaries, especially in times of wild barbarism and dissolution, as at the entrance of the Middle Ages, was in the hand of God a great blessing, in mightily promoting the spread of the gospel among the rude nations and under numberless privations?[†] Here Christianity deviates from the old Jewish view, in which ce-

^{*}V. 7, 32. Comp. Math 22: 30. Luke 20: 34-36.

[†]Comp. Neander's remarks, I. p. 404. Not seldom is celibacy also very favorable to great scientific investigations in the theological, as well as the secular field. We may here refer only to two very different men, Dr. Neander, the historian, and Alexander von Humboldt, the naturalist. We cannot help observing here, that the work of home and foreign missions would be in many respects greatly facilitated, and much expense spared, if among us Protestants that moral heroism of self-denial, that voluntary and, if not perpetual, yet at least temporary *ενοουχισμος δια την βασιλειαν των ουρανων*, (Math. 19: 12,) were more frequent, than it unfortunately is. The great zeal, with which many young ministers, scarcely ordained, (often even while students) look around for a wife, as though they had nothing more important to do, is absolutely irreconcilable, at least with the seventh chapter of 1 Corinthians and with the example of Paul. The excellent Swiss divine, A. Vinet, expresses similar opinions on the relative value of celibacy as a voluntary service to the kingdom of God, in his *Pastoral Theology*, transl. by Dr. Skinner, p. 156 sqq.

libacy was a disgrace and a curse ; it can transform this state into a charism and use it for its own ends. Without the acknowledgment of the peculiar value and manifold benefits of this virginity, which grew out of unreserved enthusiasm for Christ and his gospel, it is impossible properly to understand the history of the Church, especially before the Reformation.

But in the chapter before us Paul goes yet further. He manifestly gives celibacy the preference, believing that it enables a man better to serve the Lord ; and he wishes, that all might be in this point like himself, and might share with him the happiness of freedom from all earthly cares and undivided devotion to the highest objects and duties of life. His words are too clear to admit of any other interpretation : " He that giveth (a daughter) in marriage doeth well ; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better," (1 Cor 7: 38.) " He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord ; but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife," (v. 32 sqq.) " I would that all men were even as myself," (v. 7.) Here undeniably that ascetic tendency and relative depreciation of marriage, which we find in almost all the Church fathers, even the married ones, (as Tertullian and Gregory of Nyssa,) has some plausible foundation to rest upon. Yet we cannot, without charging Paul with obscurity and inconsistency, understood him as derogating from the holiness and dignity of marriage, which in Eph. 5* he himself so decidedly asserts. The apparent contradiction may be solved by the following considerations suggested by the connection of the passage itself :

1. It must be remembered, that, in the time of the apostle, the education of the female sex, and the whole married life, were in a very low state ; that Christianity had scarcely begun to exert its refining influence upon them ; and that the elevation and sanctification of them must, in the nature of the case, be gradual. In 1 Cor. 7, Paul has in view the relations actually prevailing in a congregation but just gathered from amongst the frivolous heathens of dissolute Corinth, and, therefore, such a marriage as by no means answers to the Christian principle, or to the ideal, sketched by himself in Eph. 5: 32. He has his eye upon a union, which stands in the way of prayer (v. 5,) entangles one in worldly cares, conflicts with the

*Comp. 1 Cor. 7: 28. 9: 5. 1 Tim. 5: 14. Titus. 1: 6 sqq.

undivided service of the Lord (32-35,) and is, in general, nothing more than a mere check upon debauchery (v. 2, 5, 9: *Κρατεῖσθε γὰρ ὅτι γὰρ ἡ τὴν πορνείαν.*) Here firm opposition to corrupt heathenism was the safe and necessary way to the final realization of the true idea of marriage. So the Church at first stood hostile to art, on account of its degradation to the service of idolatry and immorality; yet, at a later day, herself gave birth to the highest creations of architecture, painting, music, and poetry.

2. The apostle plainly has in view approaching pressure and persecution, which are certainly heavier on the married than on the single, and furnish strong temptations to unfaithfulness to the Lord from personal considerations. This is evident particularly from v. 26, which speaks of "the present distress;" v. 28, of "trouble in the flesh;" and v. 29-32, of the "shortness of the time," earnestly exhorting Christians to rise above everything earthly, and be ready for the approaching end.* The Christians were then expecting the speedy return of the Lord (as in fact he actually came, though not to the final judgment, yet to the destruction of Jerusalem,) and it appeared doubly advisable to await the catastrophe in a state of the greatest possible independence of worldly cares and connections. That there are, however, at this day, circumstances, in which it would be an indiscretion involving heavy responsibility for certain individuals to marry, can by no means be denied. The advice of the apostle, therefore, has by no means lost its force and applicability.

3. All this instruction on the question proposed to him by the Corinthians, respecting marriage and celibacy, Paul repeatedly assures us (v. 6, 25, 40,) he gives as his own private judgment, as his humble opinion (*γνώμη*) and not as an express command of the Lord (*ἐντολή*) who had given him no special, direct revelation on the subject.† Hence, to prescribe laws

*Möhler's is certainly not unbiased, when in his defense of celibacy (*Gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze*, I. p. 197) he denies any such reference to approaching dangers in 1 Cor. 7. The "*διὰ τὴν ἐνστανταὶ ἀνάγκην*," v. 26, he translates: "on account of the (easily) rising natural appetite," and refers to a passage in *Heroph. de venat.* c. vii, where *ἀνάγκη* denotes the impetus ad Venerem. But even admitting the philological consideration, (the passage adduced, by the way, is not about men, but about dogs!) this interpretation gives no good sense at all, because the *ἀνάγκη* in this sense exists also in celibacy, nay, is even still stronger in this state, (Comp. v. 9;) and hence the avoidance of it can be no ground for recommending virginity.

†In this case, therefore, at least, the possibility of error is admitted, espe-

on this point, is to assume more than apostolical authority. The *prohibition* of marriage is expressly enumerated by the same apostle among the marks of antichrist. (1 Tim. 4: 3.)†

Our conclusion, therefore, is, that, according to the doctrine and practice of the apostles, marriage is duty, in general, but, under certain circumstances and for certain individuals, celibacy; that the latter may be as great a blessing to the Church and to mankind as the former; that the decision, however, in any particular case, whether to marry or not, must rest neither on the person's own will nor on another's, but on a consideration of the person's peculiar gift, and the plain indications of Providence. The great work of the man remains, in both cases, the same:—to serve the Lord and Him alone. To do this, in whatever way, is neither greater nor less *merit*, but our bounden duty, and should be, at the same time, our honor and our joy.

To the family, in the wide sense, belong also *servants* or *domestics*, rendered necessary by the distinction of rich and poor, and by wants, which increase by civilization, and which the proper members of the family alone are unable or unwilling themselves to meet. Here Christianity, when it entered the world, had to encounter a deeply rooted social evil, which, in consequence of the fall, had gradually spread over the most cultivated nations of Heathendom, and, we may truly say, then held the *greater* part of the human race in a condition of almost beastly degradation.||

Slavery is the robbing an immortal man, created in the image of God, of his free personality, degrading him to an article of

cially as the personal experience of Paul on this point was all on one side, an experience of the advantages of the single life, but not of those of the married. In his thus qualifying his own advice, we must admire his great pastoral wisdom and prudence.

†Comp. also Harless: *Ethik*. p. 219.

||Attica alone, in the time of Demetrius Phalereus (390, B. C.,) according to the statement of Ktesicles, contained 400,000 slaves, with only 21,000 citizens and 10,000 foreign residents. See Böckh: *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, I, p. 89, (p. 85 sq. of the English translation by Geo. C. Lewis, 2nd ed., London, 1842.) The slaves were, indeed, counted by the head, like beasts; but even if we quadruple the number of freemen, to make it include women and children, and, with Böckh, suppose the whole population of Attica to have been at most 524,000, the number of slaves would still be almost four times that of the freemen. In Sparta, Reitmeier (*Ueber den Zustand der Sklaverei in Griechenland*, p. 116,) supposes there were even from 600,000 to 800,000 slaves. In Rome it was still worse, slaves being there an article of formal luxury.

merchandize, a mere machine of his owner, and thereby hindering the development of his intellectual and moral powers, and the attainment of the higher end of his existence. For this, heathenism had no remedy. On the contrary, the most distinguished heathens justified this immoral and unnatural state of things by assuming an original and essential distinction between the ruling and the serving classes. The Hindoos believed, that the menial caste of Sudra, upon which the other three castes looked down with contempt, had been guilty, before its earthly life, of some peculiarly heavy crime, for which this degraded condition was a just punishment; or, according to a somewhat higher view, that it had sprung from the feet of Brahma, while the Brahmins sprang from his head, the soldiers from his shoulders, and the tradesmen from his thighs. The Greeks adopted the view of Homer, that Zeus deprived those, whom he "destined for servitude," "of half their mind;" and to this passage even Plato appeals in the sixth book of the *Laws*, appearing in general to view slavery as a natural and necessary institution. § Aristotle speaks much more plainly. He defines† a slave as an ὀψιμανὸς ἄνθρωπος, a man who belongs, not to himself, but is the property of another. He declares all barbarians to be born slaves, who have no reason at all or only instinctive, and are good for nothing but to obey. Single instances of intelligent, virtuous slaves, he would have pronounced exceptions, which prove the rule. The Roman law looked upon them in the same light, subjected them to the arbitrary dominion, passion and lust of the master—yea, gave to the latter, at least down to the time of Emperor Hadrian, the uncontrolled power of life and death over his slaves. With the pagan Germans, also, the equality of the slave with the brute, of the *servus* with the *jumentum*, was current. It was in perfect consistency with such principles, that the slaves were used and abused like beasts, and not seldom, even worse. The Spartans had the abominable custom to intoxicate their helots, in order to teach their youth sobriety by such revolting spectacles of drunkenness; and when the slaves became dangerous from their increasing number, they were hunted in the *Crypteia*, as the chase was called. The

§So Ritter, with many others, asserts.—*Geesch. der Philos.* II, 450. Yet this may be questioned. For the passage in the *Politicus* (p. 309, a.) to which Ritter appeals, may be more favorably explained, as it is by Möhler, *Gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze*, II, p. 62 & 76.

†*De Republica*, I, c. 1-7.

celebrated Cato Censorius, in whose time the distinction between the two classes had not yet become so strongly marked in Rome as afterwards, worked, indeed, with his slaves, and ate at the same table with them, but mercilessly drove them away when they became weak from age, and were no longer saleable.* At a later day, slaves became a matter of luxury, like horses and precious stones. Romans of rank owned them by hundreds and thousands, and their wives likewise kept great numbers (sometimes over two hundred,) for the most trifling services connected with their endless wardrobes. Half naked, the poor wretches had to stand before their mistress, who was armed with an iron rod to beat them for every mistake. Even for innocent noises, as sneezing or coughing, they were often unmercifully whipped.†

Exceptions there certainly were. Heathendom retained a faint recollection of a golden age, when there was no sin nor slavery. It had feasts in memory of this age, such as the Saturnalia, in which the freemen ate with slaves, and even waited on them. Theseus, and the deified Hercules, once himself a slave, were patrons, and the Vestal virgins, the temples, statues and altars of the gods, and the churches of Rome, were refuges of slaves. In the old philosophers, too, we meet with many excellent precepts, framed, to be sure, not on the higher principles of religion, but only on those of humanity, respecting the kinder treatment of these wretched creatures; especially in Seneca, his letters, and his work on meekness and mildness (*De Clementia*.) After he himself had returned from an eight years' exile in Corsica, he laid down the rule in almost the same terms as those of our Lord.—Matth. 7: 12: "So live with an inferior, as thou thyself wouldst wish a superior to live with thee."† But what were the fairest precepts

*On this Plutarch, in his biography of Cato, c. 21, passes censure thus: "As if, when no further gain is to be had from them, there were no longer any room for humanity; as if equity were not more comprehensive than justice! Even dogs and other animals men continue to feed after they cease to bring them gain. The Athenians provided for the mules used in building the Parthenon till they died, though they were free from all further labor."

‡Comp. on this Böttiger's *Sabina oder Morgenscenen in dem Putzzimmer einer reichen Römerin* (1806.) Part. I, p. 40 sqq., where the proof is given.

†Epp. 47, ad Lucil.: "Sic cum inferiore vivas, quemadmodum tecum superiorem velles vivere. * * * Vive cum servo clementer, comiter quoque et in sermonem admitte, et in consilium, et in convictum," etc. See these and other passages from Seneca, Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, and the Saturnalia of Macrobius (which, however, only copies Seneca, often word for word,) in Mühlcr, l. c., p. 75 sqq.

of human philanthropy when they were never observed, or, at least, very rarely, and then not from principle and fear of God, but accidentally only, or from constitutional good nature? They could, at best, but mitigate the evil in individual cases. They could effect no radical cure. This demanded an entirely different view of the origin and destiny of man, such as Christianity alone has introduced.

Here, also, the Jews, of course, stood on much higher ground. Yet among them, too, servants, with their posterity, were in thralldom, and could be bought and sold. The Patriarchs had two kind of servants, those "born in the house," and "those bought with money," (Gen. 17: 12, 13,) who are sometimes enumerated with other property, although there is no case recorded, that they sold them. The Mosaic law did not abolish servitude, but regulated, and, in various respects, mitigated it by forbidding ill treatment, by admitting the slaves into the covenant of circumcision and its religious privileges, and by releasing them from their regular labor every Sabbath, at the three annual festivals, also on the new moons, the feast of trumpets, and the day of atonement. If they were themselves Jews, they should, after six years' service (without wife or children, however,) receive freedom, if they chose, and a small outfit of cattle and fruits. The year of jubilee made all slaves free, not only those of Israelitish descent, but also the strangers, as it would seem from Lev. 25: 10: "And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto *all the inhabitants* thereof: it shall be a jubilee unto you, and ye shall return *every man* unto his possession, and every man unto his family." This was a practical declaration, that slavery is an abnormal state of society and incompatible with a renovation of the theocracy, when all should be made to feel equally dependent upon God, and equally free in Him.† The Essenes and Therapeutae, according to Philo, repudiated all slavery as inconsistent with the native equality of men. Of course the Jews in their wars with the heathen in many cases fell into bondage. The community of Jews in Rome consisted mostly of freed men; and at the destruction of Jerusalem, according to the statement of Josephus, no less

†Comp. on this subject such passages as Gen. 12: 16. 14: 14. 17: 12, 13. 24: 35. 30: 43. Ex. 20: 10. 21: 2 sqq. 23: 17. Lev. 25: 41-46. Deut. 15: 12 sqq. 29: 10-12. Jer. 34: 8 sqq.: Michaelis: *Mosaisches Recht*, II. p. 358 sqq.; and the article "Sklaven" in Winer's *Realwörterbuch*, I. p. 475 sqq.

than ninety-seven thousand were taken captive by the Romans, some of whom were sold at auction and others transported to the Egyptian mines.

What posture now did Christianity assume towards this horrible degradation of a great, nay the greater part of mankind. We here have to admire alike the reformatory principle of Christianity and her wisdom in applying it. The apostles did not attempt even a sudden political and social abolition, and would have discountenanced any stormy and tumultuous measures to that effect. For, in the first place, the immediate abolition of slavery could never have been effected without a revolution, which would have involved everything in confusion, a radical reconstruction of the whole domestic and social life, with which the system was interwoven.* In the next place, a sudden emancipation would not have bettered the condition of the slaves themselves, but rather made it worse; for outward liberation, to work well, must be prepared by moral training for the rational use of freedom by education to mental manhood; and this can only be done by a gradual process. Paul, on the contrary, (1 Cor. 7: 17,) lays down the general principle, that Christianity primarily proposes no change in the outward relations, in which God has placed a man by birth, education, or fortune, but teaches him to look at them from a higher point of view, and to infuse into them a new spirit, until in time a suitable change work its own way outward from within. This principle he applies particularly to the case before us. On the one hand, he requires Christian masters, not to emancipate their slaves, but for the present only to treat them with Christian love, (Eph. 6: 9;) and he himself sends back from Rome the run-away Onesimus, now regenerate and thus a "beloved brother" in Christ, to his rightful master, Philemon, in Colosse, with the touching direction to receive him as kindly as he would the apostle himself, (Philem. v. 16, 17.) On the other hand, he does not exhort or encourage slaves to burst their bonds, but checks all impatient desire for freedom, and exhorts to reverential, single-hearted obedience to masters, be they hard or gentle.†

* For the slaves were employed not only in domestic service, but in all sorts of business, grinding, baking, cooking, making clothes, waiting on gentlemen and ladies, carrying letters, attending to agriculture, and the keeping of cattle, working mines, &c., &c. Böckh: *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, I. p. 40.

† 1 Cor. 7: 21, 22. Eph. 6: 5-7. Col. 3: 22. 1 Peter 2: 18. 1 Tim. 6: 1 (where the *ὁ κύριος* forbids to think of free servants.) Titus. 2: 9.

Christianity, however, has also provided the only means for delivering man from the inward and most cruel bondage of sin, the bitter root of all wrong social relations, slavery and despotism among the rest, and for the radical cure, therefore, of the evil in question. It confirms, in the first place, the Old Testament doctrine of the original unity of the human race and its descent from a single pair.* Then it asserts the perfect equality of men in the highest spiritual view, in their relation to Christ, who has redeemed all, even the poorest and meanest, with his blood, and called them to the same glory and blessedness. In Christ, all earthly distinctions are inwardly abolished. In him there is neither Jew nor Greek, *bond* nor *free*, male nor female; all form one ideal person in Him, the common Head, (Gal. 3: 28. Col. 3: 11.) On the one hand, therefore, the Christian master is a servant of Christ, with whom there is no respect of persons, and he ought always to be conscious of this dependence and of the responsibility it involves, (Eph. 6: 9.) On the other, the slave is by faith a freed-man of Christ, in the blessed possession of the only true liberty, that of the children of God, and thus even though remaining in his bonds, he is raised above them; while the richest prince, without faith, is but a miserable slave of sin and death. Hence the master should look upon his servant as also his brother in Christ, and treat him accordingly, (Philem. v. 16, 17;) the servant should obey, not as the slave of man, but for the sake of the Lord. "Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven." "Servants, obey in all things, (of course not in things contrary to the divine command, for here the injunction ceases to be of force) your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God: and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the (heavenly) inheritance; for ye serve the Lord Christ."†

By this view the distinction of master and slave is at once inwardly obliterated and deprived of its sting, even where it outwardly remains. Christianity is so spiritual and universal, that it can exert its power in all conditions and relations, and turn, as by magic, even the hut of deepest misery into a heaven of peace and joy. Thus there are now slaves, who through

* Acts 17: 26. Comp. Rom. 5: 12. 1 Cor. 15: 22, 47.

†Col. 3: 22—24; 4: 1. Comp. Eph. 6: 5—9.

their virtue and piety are infinitely freer than their masters and put them to shame. On the other hand, a true Christian, who comes into possession of slaves by inheritance, will never treat them as slaves in the proper sense, but as free servants, with all love and kindness; he will seek in every way to promote their moral and religious culture, even if circumstances, for which he is not personally answerable, should make their formal emancipation for the time impracticable. But of course this alone is not enough. All, that is inward, must in the end work itself out and fully establish itself as an outward fact in actual life. So Paul expressly says to the slave: "But if thou mayest be made free, use it rather," (1 Cor. 7: 21).^{*} Hence the spirit and genius of Christianity, more powerful than any particular command, has in all ages, without any radical noise and revolution or contempt for historically established legal rights and the principles of equity, urged towards the orderly constitutional abolition of slavery; and though it has not even yet everywhere succeeded—in the freest land in the world, in the most glaring inconsistency with its fundamental political principles, there are still more than three millions of negro slaves!—yet it will not rest till by the power of redemption all the chains, which sin has forged, shall be broken; till the personal and eternal dignity of man shall be universally acknowledged, and the idea of evangelical freedom and fraternal fellowship perfectly realized.

^{*}In the interpretation of this passage I agree with Calvin, Grotius and Neander (I p. 427) who to *μᾶλλον χρησάι* supply the words *τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ*, most naturally suggested by what immediately precedes. The supplying of *τῇ δουλείᾳ*, preferred by Chrysostom, Theodoret and others, reversing the sense and making the apostle give the preference to servitude, does not suit the verb at all and is by no means required by the *εἰ καὶ*, as Meyer and De Wette erroneously assert. The sense of Paul then is: Civil bondage is perfectly consistent with Christian freedom, and thy condition should give thee no trouble on this score; but if, besides the inward freedom of faith, thou mayest also attain the outward, as an additional (*καὶ*) good, of course, by proper legal means—reject not the opportunity, but rather thankfully use it.

ART. II.—MAN'S TRUE DESTINY.

A Baccalaureate Address to the First Graduating Class of Franklin and Marshall College, August 31, 1853. By the Rev. J. W. NEVIN, D. D., late President of Marshall College.

YOUNG GENTLEMEN :

By invitation of the Board of Trustees of Franklin and Marshall College, and at your own special and earnest request as a Class, I stand before you on this occasion to pronounce a few parting words in the name of the Board, in the name of the Faculty, and in my own name, in the way of *Baccalaureate Address*. The position is to myself one of more than usual interest and solemnity. The duty which it calls me to discharge, belongs of right to the relation I have borne to you for years as the President of Marshall College. It is not as a stranger, nor as the temporary representative simply of the government of this new institution for the service in hand, that I now speak to you, as a class, for the last time. I appear before you rather in the character of a father, whose responsible privilege it has been to preside over the course of your college education from its commencement to its close, and whose concern for your future welfare is conditioned thus by innumerable cares, and sympathies, and reciprocal affections, the proper growth of such endearing connection, which reach away back into days and years that are past. This relation itself, however, so far as the idea of outward office is concerned, has also passed away. All that remains of it is its moral life and power, which ought to be perpetual. In the present transaction, accordingly, the official in every view may be regarded as overwhelmed and lost in the personal; while all the circumstances of the occasion conspire to crowd the personal, at the same time, with memories and associations of the most solemnly affecting kind. Any College Commencement is solemn, mirroring as it does, for every thoughtful mind, the great law of change, by which, in the drama of full life, one generation is continually passing away to make room for another.

But on this occasion, we have something more than such an anniversary in its ordinary form. I see before me the first Graduating Class of one institution, which is, in a certain sense, at the same time, the last of a whole series of such Classes belonging to the history of another. These seem to rise in long review before my mind, and to join their presence with yours in the tender solemnities of this parting hour. You will not take it amiss then, if I consider myself speaking to them along with you, in the present address. It is in virtue of a past relation only, at all events, a relation which has now come to an end, that I am here to speak at all. Let this relation then be owned to-day in its broadest extent. Let me feel that the farewell words I now utter, are dedicated as a tribute of affection to all the Alumni, to all who have ever been students of Marshall College.

The true destination of man, the proper end of his being and life, lies beyond the present world in an order of things which is supernatural; and it is absolutely necessary that he should know this, and have supreme practical regard to the fact, in order that he may not live in vain.

This is the theme on which I propose to speak; the one great thought I wish to bring before you, and to leave with you, in the full earnestness of its own proper consequences and relations. May the Spirit of all truth and grace so hallow the naturally sacred associations of this present occasion, that they may serve to fix deeply and lastingly in your minds the living force of the thought itself, so that it shall be found hereafter the pole-star of your existence, lighting it till life shall end onwards and upwards always to the glorious immortality of the saints in heaven.

The necessity of owning a supernatural destiny in the case of man, lies to a certain extent in his natural constitution itself, in the relation he is seen and felt to bear to the world around him in his present mortal state. This relation in one view is of the most close and intimate kind. The organization of the world, as a system of nature, comes to its completion in his person. This is signified to us very plainly in the Mosaic account of the creation; where the whole magnificent process, rising gradually from one stage of order and life to another, is represented as reaching its climax finally on the sixth day, when God said: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowls of the air, and over the cattle, and over all

the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." Man thus is strictly the perfection of nature, the crown of its glory, the very centre of its life. In him the world comes to its last, deepest, fullest significance and sense. So to some extent even in his mere bodily organization. But far more still in his soul, in his intelligence, in the self-acting power of his will—that higher life of reason, of which only the most dim and remote foreshadowings are to be met with in the lower spheres of creation, but whose appearance here at once proclaims itself to be the central light, that reflects back on every other part of the system its true meaning and form. In such relation simply to the present world, our human intelligence and will, notwithstanding the spirituality which belongs to them in their own character, are to be regarded as appertaining still to the constitution of nature. They are the sublimation of this indeed to its highest potency, its most ethereal quality and sense, and present it thus under a form where to be true to itself it *ought* to pass away in the presence of a higher and more enduring economy; but the sublimation itself, the taking up of the world of nature into the world of mind, is now in and of itself the subjection of it in this way, to the claims and purposes of every such economy above nature. The process may stop with the mere *intellectualization*, so to speak, of the present order of things, the world as it now stands; and then it matters not how far the activity of thought may seem to go, exploring the depths or scaling the heights of God's creation; it matters not with what flights of science or art it may appear even to pass over the boundaries of time and space, and to hold communion in its own way with what it is pleased to denominate the absolute and the eternal, all will remain in the end a revelation of the life of nature merely, and nothing more. The mind of Humboldt, regarded as a mirror simply of the outward world he describes, is of one order with *Cosmos*, whose image it serves so magnificently to reflect. Mirror, image, and object, belong alike to the sphere of nature, and have to do only with its organization as such. So deep and far-reaching is the relation, by which man belongs to the present world, stands in it, moves in it, finds in it his natural and congenial home. He is the consummation of nature. It unfolds the entire volume of its wealth; it comes to its full efflorescence, only in his person.

But with all this, or rather we may say for this very reason, the life which belongs to him in the order of nature, is for him

always something incomplete, a form of existence which manifestly does not find its full and proper end in itself, but needs and seeks this continually in some higher and different constitution of things. In this respect, man differs from the mere animal and the plant. Though the fulness of nature be in him, far more than it is in them, he cannot, like them, rest in it as the whole comprehension of his being. They do so, just because they are less than nature in its full sense. Their existence is rounded in by it on all sides, and made complete after its own kind, in the bosom of the general life by whose stream they are borne. But man is himself, as we have just seen, the end of nature, the point where its whole process reaches its ultimate destination. How then should he find in it his own destination or end? The universal constitution of the present world, viewed in its relation to man, carries in it thus a plain intimation that he is formed for a higher sphere of existence, that the life of nature is designed to be in him the beginning only and preparation of a life above nature, and that he can fulfill his destiny only by entering into felt communication with the powers of this *super-natural* life, and by proposing it to himself always as his last object and aim. The world, as a system of nature, completes itself in man, becomes in him a moral world, a world of intelligence and active will, in order simply that it may, through him, become linked, under such form, with another economy far more glorious than itself. Without such object and end, it must be regarded as an insupportable vanity. In itself, it is made up of perpetual revolution and change. The fashion of it is forever passing away. Its best realities are always like a dream or a shadow. It is everywhere an effort after that which is not, a type that labors to express its own sense, an unfulfilled prophecy which struggles towards its accomplishment in something beyond itself. To suppose such an order of things brought to its full conclusion in man's consciousness, made clear to itself here, as it were, in the full perfection of its vanity, without any farther promise or prospect, would be to turn this human consciousness, the high prerogative of reason, into the greatest vanity and most deplorable misery of all. That cannot be the meaning or end of God's natural creation. It looks upward towards man from all sides, not that it may stop there as an eternal irony upon itself, but that by him and through him it may be enabled, as it were, to transcend itself, and to make room thus for a new, higher creation, in which all its transitory show shall be brought

finally to an end. Nature reaches its chief purpose and ultimate destination in man, and, in doing so, refuses to be acknowledged as in any way *his* end, but shuts him up rather to the necessity of seeking this in some other order of existence altogether.

And is it necessary to add, that what is in this way continually proclaimed by the general constitution of the world, finds its full echo in the moral nature of man himself? Whatever relation his intelligence and will may bear to the present world as such, they carry in their very constitution at the same time, no less distinctly, a necessary reference also to something beyond this world, to a higher economy, which is felt to extend over it in the form of truth and law, and in which alone is to be sought and found its highest and last end. The human mind, while it forms the natural summit and necessary crown of the whole inferior creation, includes in itself also what surpasses entirely the measure of this creation, capacities, affinities, tendencies, inborn necessities and wants which it has no power to satisfy, and that call continually for that which it does not contain. It is only in virtue of such higher nature indeed, that man is set rightfully over the world, and appointed to rule it for the glory of God; the intelligence that qualifies him for this being in truth a superior order of existence, which places him above the world as well as in it, by reason of what it is in such more than simply natural view. It is only as made in the image of God, that mind in this case is commissioned to exercise dominion over nature and matter; which at once implies, that to be faithful to itself, and true to its high trust, it must hold itself steadily in union with God, and seek in Him always its last destination and end. Thus it is, accordingly, that the soul of man finds it forever impossible to be either wholly or finally satisfied with the present world, and so long as it seeks to be so is tormented continually with a sense of falsehood and vanity. Whatever it may be for inferior orders of life, the present world is not, in any true sense, an end for man, and the attempt to make it so must always be felt as the power of a perpetually living lie, which carries along with it its own damning punishment wherever and however it may prevail. There is no material difference here between one form and another of such a worldly life. It may be rude or refined, grossly sensual or eminently spiritual; all comes to the same thing at last, an overwhelming confirmation of that old experience: "Vanity of vanities—all is vanity and

vexation of spirit!" The desires of the mind, as Paul terms them, have no advantage in this respect over the desires of the flesh. Nay, the greatest vanity of all, perhaps, is science, walking among the stars in its own way, and yet never, in fact, transcending the universe of nature, the order of the world as it now stands, by a single act of faith.

But it is in the sphere of religion and conscience, especially, that the necessary relation of man's life to an order of things which is above and beyond nature, so far as his own consciousness is concerned, comes most of all into view. Religion has no meaning except as it carries with it a reference always to some order of this sort, and without such reference there could be no place for it in the human spirit. Whether the religion be true or false is of no account as regards this point. What we are concerned with is simply the general idea of religion, the possibility of it in any form. This, of course, is something which lies back of all positive systems, to which the name may be applied. No outward teaching or tradition, no divine revelation, even, could cause religion to exist in any form among men if there were not in them previously a religious nature, a capacity for religion, needing to be called into exercise in this way. Now it is of this general capacity we say, lying, as it does, at the ground of all religions and making them possible, that it carries in it a necessary reference always to an economy which is beyond and above nature, and thus becomes an unanswerable argument, throughout the world, for the truth and importance of the thought we have in hand, namely, that the true end of man's life, his proper destiny, is to be sought in the world to come and not in that which is now present. For the sense of religion, in some form, is as universal as our human nature itself, and forms an inseparable part of its constitution; and it includes in itself everywhere, also, the assurance of its own legitimate authority, and its right to be regarded as a supreme power in the organization of our life. The want it expresses is felt to be the deepest, the end it seeks the most absolute, in the mysterious economy of our being. It is not hypothetically or problematically only, but with full categorical imperative, that the chief end of man is referred here to another world, and that he is required to subordinate to this all other ends as of merely secondary account. Such is the natural testimony of the soul, with regard to its own destination. No force of error or corruption can ever reduce it to silence. It speaks in the individual conscience of every

man. It is heard in the religious faith and worship of nations, handed forward as a sacred tradition from one generation to another, deep answering unto deep, as it were, in the vast and mighty abyss of the human spirit, and the voice of ages, like the sound of many waters, uttering itself forever in one and the same awfully solemn tone.

Infidels sometimes make it an argument against the whole idea of a revelation, and so of a strictly supernatural destiny for man, that the organization of nature is complete within itself, and that it offers no room directly for the apprehension or acknowledgment of any higher system. The supernatural as related to the natural must, of necessity, be miraculous; and the miraculous, according to the celebrated sophism of Hume, must ever meet an overwhelming contradiction from the universal experience of our present life, which is conditioned throughout by the constitution of the world as it now stands. In these circumstances, all positive systems of religion, falling back, as they do necessarily, on some supposed revelation, are to be regarded as visionary and false; and still further proof of which may be found in their contradictory character, as well as in the palpable absurdity and immorality by which most of them belie at once their own high claims. These manifold superstitions in the name of religion, monstrous abortions as they are of the human spirit, all pretending to rest on supernatural facts, show only how liable men are to deceive themselves in this direction, and how little weight is to be attached to any such pretension in any quarter. Thus runs, in brief, the sceptical argument. But its show of wisdom is entitled to small respect. It comes, at most, simply to this, that the order of nature is not itself the order of the supernatural, that the second absolutely transcends the first, and that there is no room, therefore, to conceive of the first as itself producing or demonstrating the second. Most certainly nature includes no provision in its own constitution, as nature merely, for the production or verification of that which is positively above nature. Such want of capacity, however, to go beyond or transcend itself, to be at one and the same time what it is and what it is not, is something very different from the supposition of its being actually at war with all that may be supposed to exist beyond its own sphere. Between the natural and the supernatural in this view, as we have now seen, no such antagonism in fact has place, but just the reverse. The world as it now stands, the cosmos whether of Humboldt or of Kant,

has no power, it is true, to affirm supernatural realities in their own proper form; they lie *over* its horizon; but it goes far to show negatively and indirectly their necessity, and to turn the eye of expectation and desire towards the region in which they are found. Time points always towards eternity. Nature cries aloud for that which is higher, greater, and more enduring than itself. The world that now is, with man in the centre of it, is a riddle whose burden can find no relief except in the thought of a world to come. The whole moral and religious side of man's life especially proclaims, with uncontrollable witness, his supernatural destiny, and leads him to acknowledge his relation to the invisible and eternal through all ages and times. It is not true, that the ideas of miracle and revelation do violence to his nature; on the contrary, he feels them to be in full harmony with its inmost wants, and, as it would appear, is unable to live without them indeed in any part of the world. False religions, in this way, are no argument against the truth of religion itself. They only show how deeply seated the idea of religion is in the very constitution of humanity; how irresistibly this looks and tends towards what is beyond the world of nature for its proper completion; and how natural and reasonable it is, therefore, to believe, that provision should be made for the satisfaction of so deep a want in some real way. This universal demand among men for religion in some form, both proves the reality of the supernatural relations on which the whole idea rests, and creates a presumption at the same time, not against, but powerfully in favor of any system which may present itself with the proper credentials of a true revelation.

Such a revelation, it is plain, the whole case requires. The voice of nature, and the testimony of the soul, refer man for the end of his being to another world; but they have no power to set before him the actual realities of this world in their own proper form; their utterances, as we have already seen, are negative rather than positive in their character; and, for this reason, even the truth which they proclaim may be said to be wanting in full security and force. To the solemn question: "Where shall wisdom be found; and where is the place of understanding?" the answer they return is: "Man knoweth not the price thereof; neither is it to be found in the land of the living. The depth saith, It is not in me; and the sea saith, It is not with me. It cannot be gotten for gold, neither shall silver be weighed for the price thereof. It cannot be

valued with the gold of Ophir, with the precious onyx, or the sapphire." In other words, the true destiny of man, the proper end of his life, is something which, according to the testimony of the world itself, is not to be found in all that it contains, nor to be represented for a moment by its richest forms of wealth. It belongs to another order of existence altogether. "Destruction and death say, We have heard the fame thereof with our ears." Natural religion points darkly to God, as comprehending in Himself in some way what the case is felt to require, and brings all to the momentous conclusion: "Behold the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom, and to depart from evil, that is understanding." But to give full effect to this conclusion, the voice of revelation must be added to the voice of nature. The supernatural must make itself known, not as a notion or thought merely, but as an actual reality, comprehending in it the very end itself for which man is thus required to live. This has been done, as we know, by the Gospel; which is to be regarded as a single revelation, shining more and more "as a light in a dark place" through the times of the Old Testament, till it burst forth finally with full effulgence in Him who is the "sun of righteousness," who, by the mystery of his incarnation, became himself among men the full manifestation of the truth under a living personal form; who, by his death and resurrection, "brought life and immortality to light," and who now reigns "Head over all things to the Church," a Prince and Saviour at the right hand of God, to give repentance and remission of sins, redemption and eternal salvation, to all who draw near to God in his name. "God, who, at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son."

To say now that this glorious Gospel of the Blessed God places the chief end of man, the only true and proper destination of his life, in an order of things which is above and beyond the present world, is simply to declare what no one in his senses pretends to dispute. The only difficulty is, that the sense and meaning of it in this view are so common, so universally at hand, so much a matter of course, that the thought, by its very familiarity, fails to gain with most persons any distinct attention. Not only is it assumed throughout, that the constitution of nature is destined to pass away, and that the soul of man is formed for eternity; but the ground is everywhere taken, also, that the world, as it now stands, is

under a curse, that the relation men hold to it naturally in their present state is the result of an original universal apostasy or fall, by which they have lost their proper relation to God and their right to eternal life, that it is in these circumstances under the power of Satan, and subject to a law of sin and death, and that there is no room, therefore, to conceive of any harmony or agreement between its interests and purposes, in such view, and the true last object of man's creation. All this comes before us abundantly in the general teaching of the Bible; but most of all, with overwhelming emphasis, in the actual life of our Lord Jesus Christ. In him we see the truth itself, confronted in living form with the fallen world in the midst of which he moved without sin; and in no other way, certainly, could the full sense of what this world is in its relation to our human life generally be so effectually brought home to our minds. He came to seek and to save that which was lost, by conquering death and him that had the power of death, and by revealing or bringing to pass in and through his own person the kingdom of heaven, in which room is made for the complete fulfilment of man's destiny in a higher order of life that shall never come to an end. In calling us to such glory and honor and immortality, the Gospel, in the very nature of the case, requires us to enter into his spirit, to walk in his steps, to propose to ourselves the same supernatural end, and to aim at reaching it by renouncing and forsaking the present world. "Seek ye first," it is said, "the kingdom of God and his righteousness."—"He that seeketh his life, shall lose it."—"The kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field, the which when a man hath found he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field."—"Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do; but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him."—"One thing is needful; and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her."—"Sell that ye have, and give alms: provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth. For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also."—"For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth

on him that sent me hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."—"I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."—"These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." These are specimens merely of the way, in which Christ continually enforces the thought, that men are formed for an eternal destiny, and that this is to be reached only through himself as "the way, the truth, and the life," by giving up this world and living supremely for another. And so throughout the New Testament, the idea of Christianity is made to consist, especially, just in this, that we are saved from the vanity and misery of a simply natural life, and placed in real, felt communication with a life that is supernatural, of which Christ is the source and the Holy Ghost the medium, and which carries in it thus the sure guaranty of an everlasting victory over all the powers of sin and death and hell.

The true destiny of man, the grand object and purpose of his existence, being thus not in the present world at all, but in an order of things which is out of it, above it and beyond it, and so in relation to it strictly supernatural, it becomes at once, of itself, plain, that no one can live to purpose, who does not know and acknowledge this end in its own proper character, so as to make it, in reality, the governing power of his life. It is not enough that we have been created for such end; nor yet that we may see and feel the necessity of it, as something beyond this world. The case calls for purpose and will, in view of an object which is known to be real. This comes before us here in the form of a supernatural revelation, brought to its full accomplishment in Christ; and the power by which we are set in actual communication with it, is what we denominate faith, "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Only where the soul comes to understand its true destination in this way, and is led to regard and follow it with active resolution as a supreme end, can there be room to speak of it as fulfilling, in any measure, the object of its existence. Human life universally must be regarded as a failure, no matter what it may seem to accomplish in any other view, if it be not ordered in harmony thus with its own proper purpose and design, as something which is to be reached in another world and not in the present.

This, then, is the summit of all education, the perfection of knowledge and wisdom, that a man should comprehend and practically pursue the true end of his being, by seeking first the kingdom of God and his righteousness. It is so, not simply from the worth of the object, in itself considered, as weighed against all other interests, but still more immediately, also, because it serves to bring into the soul, at once, order, harmony, light, freedom, and strength, by setting it in right relation to the law of its own life. All things are beautiful and strong in their place, only as they obey the law of their nature, stand in their appointed sphere, and fulfill their original destination; and so man, as made at first in the image of God and formed for immortality, can never be true to himself in any stage of his existence, in any sphere or department of his life, except as he is brought to live supremely for this supernatural end and no other. This is for him emphatically the *truth*, the fundamental reality of things as they are and ought to be, in the apprehension of which as a living fact consists the idea of all *wisdom* rightly so called. For wisdom, as distinguished from mere knowledge or science, has to do with actual life, with truth in its practical relations to the will, as well as in its merely theoretic relations to the understanding; and it necessarily reaches its highest form, accordingly, where it comes to the perception and acknowledgment of what is in reality the chief end of our life. Hence it is said, that the fear of the Lord, which is only another name for religion, or the practical sense of our relations to God and another world, is the beginning of wisdom; for the simple reason, that here begins, in fact, for man, all apprehension of that which is for him the actual truth of his own nature, and so the true sense and meaning also of the universe to which he belongs. The living sense of this comprehension in an economy which is higher than nature, and the issues of which belong to eternity, carrying along with it the practical submission of the soul to its authority, is literally both the commencement and the perpetual foundation and ground of all right thinking, no less than all right acting, on the part of men, in any and every direction. This is to be in the truth, and so to possess it under its own highest and only complete form, instead of having only the notion or shadow of it in the understanding. Such right posture with regard to the actual order and end of our own being is of more account than any condition besides, for understanding whatever pertains to the welfare and dignity of our life,

whether in this world or in that which is to come. "If any man *will* to do my will," our Saviour says,—if it be his mind and purpose to be thus in the truth—"he shall *know* of the doctrine, whether it be of God." And of the same import is that most significant word: "The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, the whole body shall be full of light; but if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness." All depends on the inward bent and habit of the soul with regard to its own proper destination, whether it be itself in conformity thus with the law of truth, or under the power of a lie. In this last case, the condemnation is, we are told, "that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." Their unbelief is simply the result of their wish and determination to make the present world their end and portion. To men of this sort Christ says: "*Because* I tell you the truth, ye believe me not.—He that is of God, heareth God's words; ye *therefore* hear them not, because ye are not of God." The minds of such, according to St. Paul, are blinded by the god of this world, "lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them;" for which reason the reigning course of this world is said also, in another place, to be "according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." St. John abounds in the same thought. Truth with him is always life. "We know that we are of God," he writes, "and the whole world lieth in wickedness. And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." To be on the outside of this supernatural system of grace, in which is comprehended the highest relations and interests, and so the highest realities, of the proper life of man, is to be by that very fact involved in all falsehood and error. The error is not a false proposition simply, for the understanding; nor yet a partial mistake only of purpose and practice at some particular point; it embraces the entire man, mind, soul, and body, we may say, and turns his whole existence into a falsehood. He becomes by means of it, and remains continually, a *living personal lie*. What room can there be in a case so dreadful as this, to speak rationally of knowledge, learning, wisdom, under any different form? How can any amount of

science and culture avail to redeem from vanity, a life which is thus false throughout to its constitution, and which is itself no better than a hollow dream, and for which in this state the whole world must prove to be at last but shadow and sham? With what depth of meaning the Bible applies to every one, who is under the power of such a false life, the emphatic title *Fool!* All other forms of folly are in truth small, compared with this.

Here indeed is wisdom, the crowning excellency of all education, and of all knowledge and art besides, that a man should be in the truth, and know that which is for him in reality the deepest meaning of the universe, by having it for the very form of his own life. How easy it is to see, that the smallest measure of understanding in this form is of infinitely more worth, than the largest stores of learning or skill in any different view. What shall it profit a man, we may say, though he should know the whole world besides, and have no true knowledge of himself? What truth can there be in any other science or art for him, to whom the "light of life" is wanting in his own soul? We have no right to undervalue education and learning in any direction; and I have no disposition to do so certainly on the present occasion; but we must not shrink still from seeing and owning here what is after all, but the simple truth, namely, that no conceivable amount of such culture can deserve to be placed for one moment in comparison with the inward habit of piety which consists in fearing God and keeping his commandments. Without this, the greatest philosopher is less wise in fact than the unlettered rustic to whom it may belong. The science of the saints is something far more high and glorious than any mere learning of the schools. It has to do with vastly superior objects, moves in loftier and wider regions of thought, and brings into the soul an immeasurably clearer illumination. "The entrance of thy words giveth light," says the Psalmist, "it giveth understanding unto the simple." The revelation of the *Logos*, the Divine Word, by the mystery of the incarnation, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," the most pure and perfect manifestation of truth in the world, was not to teach men the hidden secrets of nature, the laws of matter, the principles of government, or any other knowledge of this sort belonging merely to the present life, but to set them in right relation to God and their eternal destiny; something which for this very reason must be accounted of more consequence than any other kind of knowledge

which it is possible for them to possess. "In him was life"—not theory, merely, or outward doctrine—"and the life was the *light* of men," served to bring them into the truth itself under its highest form. "I am the light of the world," our Saviour says accordingly; "he that followeth me, shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." Such illumination is, of course, practical. There is no separation here between the understanding and the will. Knowledge is at the same time charity; without which, all gifts and accomplishments are pronounced by the apostle Paul to be of no worth whatever. With this comes also true freedom and strength. "If ye continue in my word," Christ says, "ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." To know, in this case, is to *be* at the same time in what is known; and it is easy enough to see, how such living union with the truth, such settlement and consolidation of the mind, on the true last ground of its own being, where it is set in harmony also with the will of God and the actual order of things, must prove at the same time, its happy emancipation, so far as this right order prevails, from all false authority and power; and how utterly impossible it is, I may add, that liberty should exist at all, or be anything more than an empty chimera, under any other imaginable character and form. And to be thus in the truth, is to be strong also in the only proper and full sense of the word. We often hear it said, that knowledge is power; and this is true to a certain extent, no doubt, of all merely secular knowledge, as related to the ends of the present life. It is more in this respect than money, which is power also in a very high degree. In our own day especially, science rules the earth, and is fast subduing it to the service of secular purposes and ends. But it is after all only where knowledge takes its highest form, in the character of that practical, heavenly wisdom, which consists in understanding and acknowledging the true end of life as something to be found only in God and the eternal world, that it comes to be, at the same time, what is truly comprehended in the idea of power for man. Short of this, all science and art are at best but triumphs of mind over matter, in the sphere of nature itself. What is really needed, however, is that the soul should be brought to surmount the life of nature altogether, to acquire the mastery of itself, and to overcome the world, in the prosecution of its own proper destiny beyond the grave. For every purpose of this sort, all such secular science and art are perfectly powerless. But here

precisely comes into view, the true nature and dignity of the power that is comprehended in a practical obedience to the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. Paul is beyond comparison greater than Alexander or Julius Cæsar. "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city." To walk in the Spirit, so as not to fulfil the lusts of the flesh, is more a great deal than to tunnel mountains and bridge vallies, curb the lightning and imprison steam, for the transitory uses of trade. "This is the victory that overcometh the world," says St. John, "even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?"

No wonder, that this heavenly wisdom, carrying in it thus the highest perfection of man's life, should be so commended to our regard as it is in the Holy Scriptures, and that such glowing terms should be employed to set forth its praise. The price of it is indeed above rubies. The topaz of Ethiopia cannot equal it, neither may it be valued with pure gold. "Happy is the man that findeth wisdom, and the man that getteth understanding: For the merchandise of it is better than the merchandise of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold. She is more precious than rubies; and all the things thou canst desire are not to be compared unto her. Length of days is in her right hand; and in her left hand riches and honor. Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace. She is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her; and happy is every one that retaineth her."

The whole subject reveals to us the nature, necessity, and value of *Faith*. The chief end of man, the last meaning of his life, is not comprehended in the present order of things, the passing diorama in the midst of which he is here carried forward continually to the grave. It lies in another world, in a system of things which is beyond and above nature, and so beyond the range and reach also of all merely natural understanding and knowledge. To be known and felt at all then, this supernatural economy must be exhibited to us in the form of a Divine revelation; which we are required to accept simply in this character, in order that we may make full proof of its power. Opinion, speculation, dreamy sentiment, in the case, are not enough. The world in question is not made up of negatives simply and abstractions, but of facts, realities, and actual living relations, which need to be apprehended as they are, that we may be saved by the sense of them from the vanity of our present life; and this precisely is what is accomplished for

us by faith. Through the word of God, and especially through this word presented to us bodily in the person of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, it sets us in real communication with things unseen and eternal, and makes it possible for us to have such regard to them as we ought, in working out the fearfully solemn problem of life. It is not the product in any way of reason or logic. These so far as they are concerned with natural things, or with the order only of the present world, have no power to reach the supernatural; and so far as they may be capable of being exercised upon this also, *when* known, have no power ever to originate any such knowledge. Facts here, as always, must go before intelligence and thought; and knowledge consequently must follow faith. We see then the nature of this faculty. It is the power of being firmly assured, on the testimony of God who cannot lie, that there is such a world of grace and glory as is set before us by the Gospel, not to be seen by mortal eyes, but yet surrounding us at all points, and continually near at hand, in which, and in which only, is to be accomplished the true object and end of our existence. It is the power of acknowledging the supernatural, the miraculous, the real presence of possibilities, and powers, and actual operations, that go beyond all the resources of nature and surmount all its laws, in a new order of life which is made to be actually at hand in the mystery of the Church, through the death, and resurrection, and glorification of the Son of God. On the necessity and importance of this sublime capacity, this faculty of believing realities which transcend and confound sense, more need not be said. The case speaks for itself. If the true end of our life, and so its universal significance and worth, lie not in the present world but in another; and if all wisdom for us be comprehended in the practical perception and acknowledgment of our proper destination in such view; what terms shall sufficiently express the value of faith, the only power on our side by which it is possible for us to burst the confines of time and sense, so as to communicate with what is beyond in a real and not simply imaginary and notional way. In the nature of the case, it is the gift of God; and well does it deserve the title *precious*, applied to it by St. Peter; for it lies at the foundation of all that wisdom, whose price we have already seen to be above comparison, and is the source, in a certain sense, of every grace and perfection for the human soul. Without faith, it is impossible to please God, and in vain also to think of using life to good purpose in any other way. In such

condition, man appears necessarily incomplete always, his nature shorn of its proper glory, his mind looking forth upon us at best in dismal and dim eclipse. Let this thought sink deeply into your hearts. It is something greater really and truly to believe the articles of the Apostles' Creed, every one of which is a mystery transcending the whole order of nature, than to know all that is taught in the best colleges and universities of the land. No literary diploma can ever match in honor that word to Peter: "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven!" Of the same glorious distinction our Saviour speaks, when he says: "I thank thee Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes!" Well might that great student of Nature, the late Sir Humphry Davy, tired out with her same everlasting response to all the questionings of science, *It is not in me! It is not with me!* make the memorable declaration towards the close of his life, that he envied no man any other possession whatever, such as wealth, learning, or worldly distinction, but would cheerfully give all for the one simple privilege of being able to believe firmly and steadily the realities of another world. That indeed is something better than all knowledge, and power, and riches, and glory besides.

You need this habitual, practical sense of the supernatural, that you may not walk in darkness and miss the true end of life, regarded as a purely private and personal interest. But you need it no less, in order that you may be able rightly to understand the living world around you, and so be prepared to act a right part in it in your generation. No man is at liberty to live simply and only for himself. Least of all, we may say, is he at liberty to do so, on whom God, in his providence, has been pleased to bestow special gifts and powers, especially in the way of education. You have not been educated for yourselves alone, nor mainly, but for the use and service of others. The very idea of a liberal education forbids the thought of its being devoted merely to selfish purposes and ends, under the low base form particularly which these carry with them for the most part in the present world. It is degraded, profaned, and made grossly vulgar and illiberal, by every association of this sort. But to live for the world really and to purpose, we must have clearly before our minds its true constitution, the actual meaning of it, the fundamental law of its being, its absolute

destination and end ; just what we need, in one word, in the case of our separate personal life, that it may be ordered wisely and with effect. Self-knowledge here, and the knowledge of the world, condition each other, and go hand in hand together. If we look at the human world simply as a natural organization, a system of existence whose meaning and end hold mainly in the present life, our interest in it, our care for it, our devotion to its service, will assume necessarily a corresponding form. We shall lose our thoughts and calculations altogether in the sense of its temporal relations, and can hardly fail to make all at last of simply material interests. But if this hypothesis be in itself completely false, as we know that it must be in fact if Christianity be more than a dream ; if it be certain that the chief end and last destination of the human race, collectively taken, as well of the single man, is *not* in the order of nature at all, but in a strictly supernatural economy which holds above and beyond this ; then must all such thinking and acting as are conditioned by that other false and wrong supposition be themselves false also, not according to the actual truth of things, and so of comparatively no worth in the end. We must have firm faith in the invisible and eternal world, in the grand and glorious mysteries of the Christian creed, in order that we may have any firm position, or any sure and safe judgment, or any power of right speech and action, in our relations to the present world.

And especially may this be regarded as necessary, Young Gentlemen, for the particular period and time, in which you are called to live.

We hear much said, in glorification of the present age. It is fashionable in certain quarters, to speak of it as the perfection of all ages, and to magnify the spirit of it as better and greater than the spirit of any other period that has ever yet been known in the world. It is glorified as an age of knowledge, of freedom, of rapidly advancing civilization. It is an age of vast action and talk ; an age of astonishing discoveries and inventions ; an age in which the arts of peace are everywhere successfully cultivated, giving rise to visions of outward prosperity that never entered formerly into the human mind. It is an age of progress and reform, big with the idea of its own mission to rehabilitate man in the possession of his natural rights, and to bring to an end all sorts of political oppression and abuse. In no part of the world, moreover, may it be said to be more at home, than just here in America. The genius of

the age is emphatically the genius of this rising republic. Here it reigns on all sides with a power that seems to carry all before it, and which it is considered for the most part, a privilege to honor and obey. Happy, as the song runs, is the young man, who enters upon life, on American soil, in the middle of the nineteenth century! He has only to yield himself to the genius of the country, and the spirit of the age, that he may live to purpose and do well. Let him only spread out his canvass boldly and broadly to these favoring gales; they will waft his bark happily over the sea of life, and bring it finally to its right end.

Never was there, however, under such plausible form, a more perfect delusion. The age is *not* thus infallible and safe. On the contrary, it is made up, to a terrible extent, beyond most ages that have been, of falsehood and error, sophistry and sham. This becomes evident, just as soon as we bring the strong light of eternity to bear upon it, by making earnest with the thought, that man is formed for a supernatural destiny, and for the accomplishment of this requires a real redemption, that shall deliver him from the power of this present evil world, and engage him to follow after life and immortality in another. The spirit of the age is always at war in reality with the actual truth of things, as we find this exhibited in the Gospel and in the Church; there is a necessary contradiction between this world (*το αἰῶν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*—the present *seculum*,) and the kingdom of God; the course of the world is in and of itself “according to the Prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience”—in all those, namely, who do not submit themselves with the *obedience of Faith* to the mystery of salvation in Christ. But it is peculiar in some measure to our time, that the world in its own order affects to be itself now the very form in which the true ends and purposes of Christianity are to be reached. The spirit of the age, directly or indirectly, seeks to pass itself off as an angel of light, “flying in the midst of heaven, and having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people.” In its general character, however, it remains just what the same power has always been over against the true kingdom of Christ. It has no faith in the supernatural; except as this may be brought to resolve itself into some sort of gnostic abstraction or dream; in which form it professes to hold it in high account, taking credit to itself in so doing for its own

spirituality. But its spirituality, alas, ends always in mere spiritualism, the working of the simply natural mind pretending to soar above its own sphere of the flesh, but never getting out of it in fact. For the *Spirit*, in the sense of the Gospel, the supernatural under a real form, the mystery of the creed and of the Church, this eminently spiritualistic spirit of the age has no sense or organ whatever. It eschews all that, and holds it in abomination. This notion of the real presence of supernatural powers in the Christian Church for supernatural ends, involving as it does, necessarily, the subordination of the whole order of nature to a higher economy that can be apprehended only by faith, is precisely that which it has no power to endure; and the presence of which, wherever it may come seriously into view, proves always to be for it like the touch of Ithuriel's spear, causing it to start up instantly in its true antichristian shape. However bland, liberal, and sweet, it can show itself towards the Christian profession, so long as this may be content to walk arm in arm with it in the fellowship of merely secular interests and aims, such as useful knowledge, general education, good government, humanitarian philanthropy, and all sorts of moral reform, the whole case is at once changed the moment it is presumed in any quarter to make earnest with realities, which are supposed to reach into another world. Then your bland liberal is at once converted into an intolerant fanatic. If it were Mohammedanism, Mormonism, anything else under the sun, he could bear it and have some patience with it; but to be confronted in such style with what claims to be the actual presence of the supernatural as a real force in the world, having to do with the last and highest destination of men in another life, is more than he finds it possible for a wise man to endure—especially in the middle of the nineteenth century. It is to revive the superstition of the Middle Ages; to turn religion into mechanism and mummery; to open the door for priestcraft and spiritual despotism; to own a power on earth above civil government and the sovereignty of the State, which in this case, moreover, is generally taken to resolve itself finally into the sovereignty of the people. It is at once treason thus to the sacred cause of freedom, popular rights, political economy, and modern civilization generally; and so far as it prevails must serve to keep back the millennium of the world's regeneration under this temporal and natural order, God only can tell how long. Does not the spirit of the age do well to be angry with pretensions, which thus

stultify its highest wisdom and turn the whole pride of its life into open shame? If there be any truth in these pretensions, it stands convicted of being a wholesale universal lie; and to save itself from this, being secretly conscious in fact of its own falsehood, it has no alternative but to retort the charge on the source from which it proceeds, and then to rage and storm, calumniate and misrepresent, as it best can, for the purpose of giving it effect.

Tried in this way, the spirit of the present period is easily enough found to be predominantly set on natural interests and ends, as the chief purpose of man's life, to the exclusion of such as are supernatural. It is rationalistic, humanitarian, politico-economical. Religion itself is required by it to officiate in the service of the flesh, and eternity is made to stoop obsequiously to the behests of time. For the realities of faith are substituted the spectral phantoms of opinion—or the dismal *irony*, shall we call it, of demoniacal delusions. Materialism bears rampant rule on all sides. The true victory over the world for man, is held to be more and more, not by any such supernatural process of the Spirit as was dreamed of by saints and martyrs of the olden time, but by mastering the elements of nature, multiplying machinery, promoting the facilities of commerce and trade, and making the earth to serve, as widely as possible, the comfort and well-being simply of the present life. Man is held practically, if not in set theory, to be sufficient for his own ends, without the intervention of any higher help than that which is offered to him in his natural constitution. What he is supposed to need, is education, general knowledge, proper room for the exercise of his rights, the benefit especially of republican institutions, and the practice of the natural virtues in the name of religion. Secular ends, temporal interests, the judgments of the merely natural mind in the form of reigning fashion and opinion, are made the standard of truth, and applied as a measure even to the contents of revelation itself. In all directions the most solemn points of faith and duty are settled by principles and maxims, which overthrow the idea altogether of any positive authority in the world that is higher than the world itself. Religion ceases thus to be the daughter of the skies, and loses her holy mission in what must be considered at best, enthusiasm for a simply earthly ideal.

Striking and most truly instructive exemplification of this was presented not long since, when the spirit of the age seemed

to find for a moment among us a fit *avatar* in the form of LOUIS KOSSUTH, who appeared on our shores as a martyr of the Hungarian rebellion, and a representative of the general cause of revolutionary liberty throughout Europe. It is still but as it were the other day, since the ears of the whole nation were stunned with the noise of his presence, as he passed from one part of the country to another, in a sort of grand triumphal procession, the cynosure, seemingly, of all eyes and the idol of all hearts. Seldom indeed has the delirium of man-worship been carried to a more ridiculous and fulsome extent. His words were received as oracles of wisdom; his oriental bombast was taken for the inspiration of a prophet. To speak against him, or even to be ominously silent in his praise, was held to be little less than blasphemy towards God and treason to the dearest rights and interests of man. For was *he* not the incarnation of the holy cause of freedom, a full living personification of the glorious conception of man's destiny, which forms the very life and soul of the modern revolutionary spirit throughout the world? And did he not invoke besides the authority of the Bible, the genius of Christianity itself, as in full unison with his own mission and cause? Was he not a preacher of righteousness to the nations, and a new Messiah sent forth for their redemption and salvation? Why then should he not be worshipped and glorified, like Diana of the Ephesians, or the colossal image set up by Nebuchadnezzar on the plain of Dura! So for a time, as we all know, the furor ran. It was a perfect *stampede*, not of dumb cattle, but of rational and civilized men; which, however, like all stampedes, was doomed soon to come to an end. The practical tact, and sound common sense, of the nation, acted upon by a quick apprehension also, no doubt, of its own material interests, came in due time to its relief, and gave it power to see, finally, that it had been playing the fool. Then its idol was suffered to fall silently into contempt; and before the end of a single year took its departure, under the metamorphosis of "Mr. Alexander Smith," without so much of a *Good bye sirs!* as even to pay its landlady's bill. But after all, the main significance of humbug, regarded as a mirror of the reigning mind of the age, cannot be said to be overthrown by this explosion; for the explosion was not the result properly of any insight into the essential falsehood of the idea which Kossuth represented, but came to pass rather through considerations of expediencey and interest which were connected with it only in an accidental way. It was

Yankee cunning, more than Christian principle, that turned the scale at last in favor of conservatism and common sense. His doctrine of "intervention" was found to be practically impolitic and unsafe; and so it was voted out of good company, and may be considered, for the present, as having gone its way. But the principle of it, the pretended Divine right of rebellion and revolution, the demoniacal idea that the people may upset all governments at their pleasure which do not happen to square with their own notions of liberty, has not been denounced as a general thing even by those who have taken most credit to themselves for opposing the use which it has been attempted to make of it in this way; and what is worst of all, the true relation of the whole affair to Christianity, would seem to remain still as much as ever out of view.

This is indeed deplorable. The political nonsense of the demonstration was as nothing, in comparison with the wrong it did to the religion of Jesus Christ; and until this be generally seen and felt, we have full right to refer to it as a picture, which is still of force to illustrate the subject now in hand—the wrong position, namely, and false spirit of the age, as tried by the supernatural standard of the Gospel.

It will be borne in mind, that a very active disposition was shown, on the part of the Protestant religious press generally and of the so called *evangelical* ministry in our leading cities, to identify the cause and spirit of the Hungarian chief with the very soul of Christianity itself. His notion of liberty was taken to be of one and the same order precisely with the freedom that is preached in the New Testament. His "brotherhood of nations" and "solidarity of humanity," were allowed to represent in good earnest the last aim of Christianity in the present world, as well as to overshadow completely its higher regards to another. Nothing could be clearer than the fact, that with him all faith in the invisible and eternal was the merest naturalism, and nothing more; that he saw in the Bible at best but a code of high moral maxims, capable of being turned to good account by the natural reason of men for social and particular ends; that socialistic or humanitarian philanthropism made up his whole conception of Christian charity; and that he was of one mind substantially, in his view of man's destiny, and of the problem of the world, with Ledru Rollin, Mazzini, and the leaders generally of the Red Republican movement in Europe.* In no one of his speeches, was there

* It would seem to need only the most ordinary spiritual discernment, to

expressed a particle of reverence for the Word made Flesh or for the mystery of the Holy Catholic Church. And yet in spite of all this, nay it might seem on the very strength of it, he was urged and encouraged from all sides to claim for his cause the special sympathy of heaven, and to consider himself a sort of living commentary on the inmost sense of the Gospel, as well as a martyr and confessor for its truth before the eyes of the whole civilized world. A little clap-trap in glorification of the Bible and Private Judgment, some show of respect for the Sabbath, (too thin to wear any time,) the compliment of attending church occasionally, (where he was not unlikely to have his ears tickled with something preached or *prayed* in his own praise) all joined with everlasting changes rung on the hackneyed and unmeaning themes of liberty, human rights, universal brotherhood, and the power of the world, if it were only let alone to govern and save itself, was enough, it seemed, and more than enough, to steal away the senses of his undiscerning religious admirers, and to gull them into the belief that he was a sort of hero and saint combined, who had been raised up specially by God to usher in a new era for Protestantism and *Evangelical* Christianity on both sides of the Atlantic. His interpretations of Scripture, generally flat enough, were listened to as though they were felt to drop from the skies. He was able, it appeared, to teach our divines theology, as well

see and feel the truth of this general charge in all his speeches. They are animated throughout by a spirit of Paganism, without the slightest tinge of Christianity. His memorable prayer, at the grave of the Magyar heroes who fell in the battle of Rapoynna, may stand as a fit monument of his mind in this respect. It runs thus:—"Almighty Lord! God of the warriors of Arpad! look down from thy starry throne upon thy imploring servant, from whose lips the prayer of millions ascends to thy heaven, praising the unsearchable power of thine Omnipotence. O God, over me shines thy sun, and beneath me repose the relics of my fallen heroic brethren; above my head the sky is blue, and under my feet the earth is dyed red with the holy blood of the children of our ancestors. Let the animating beams of thy sun fall here, that flowers may spring up from the blood, so that these hells of departed beings may not moulder undorned. God of our fathers, and God of the nations! hear and bless the voice of our warriors, and let the arm and the soul of brave nations thunder to break the iron hand of tyranny, as it forges its chains. As a freeman I kneel on these fresh graves: by the remains of my brothers. By such a sacrifice as theirs, thy earth would be consecrated, were it all stained with sin. O God! on this holy soil, above these graves, no race of slaves can live. O Father! Father of our fathers! mighty over myriads! Almighty God of the heaven, the earth, and the seas! from these bones springs a glory whose radiance is on the brow of my people. Hallow their dust with thy grace, that the ashes of my fallen heroic brethren may rest in peace! Leave us not, great God of battles! In the holy name of the nations, praised be Thy Omnipotence! Amen."

as our senators wisdom. Sayings and sentences from his lips on the subject of religion, now happily forgotten, were caught up as apothegms or gnomes pregnant with celestial wisdom, and sent whizzing and blazing like so many fire-balls through the length of the land. It was not enough for the religious papers to praise, laud, and bless his name, from week to week. Pulpits, in many cases, became profane and churches were desecrated, for the same end. Clerical delegations, in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington City, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, press into his presence for the very purpose of flattering his vanity, assuring him of their hearty sympathy, and bidding him God-speed in his revolutionary counsels and designs; and he is allowed, on the other hand, openly to accept these congratulatory addresses, as a formal sanction given in the name of religion, by its supposed authorized exponents, to his whole character and mission and doctrine, (*intervention* hobby and all,) as being in full accordance with the genius of Christianity, and in all respects true to the mind of its glorious and adorable Founder. Doctors of Divinity, and grave Professors of Theology figured, among others, in these demonstrations, and helped as they could, to give them solemnity and eclat. If Kossuth was not convinced of his own title to be regarded as an apostle of the last and deepest sense of Christianity for the men of the Nineteenth Century, it was not the fault, certainly, of those who thus threw themselves as the representatives of American piety in his way. They did all that could be well asked, to help him to this conclusion.

Now the misery of all this is, not just that so vast a blunder should have been committed in the name of religion, but that our religion should have been capable at all of being deceived, to so great an extent, in such gross way—and still more, that there should seem to be, even to this hour, so little sense of the true nature of the mistake. It is with the *ideal* which Kossuth was made for the moment to enshrine, far more than with the passing form of the shrine itself, that we are here concerned; and looking at this, we find occasion enough in the case for the most painful and gloomy reflection. What must we think of a Christianity, arrogating to itself the highest character of evangelical purity and truth, which could so easily and readily find what it took for its own image in the principles and pretensions of such a man! It was bad enough that he should be compared with Washington. But to make him a representative of the doctrine and spirit of Jesus Christ, to ac-

cept his rhodomontade about liberty, and philanthropy, and human rights, for the faith and charity which were preached by St. Paul, the lofty morals of St. Peter, or the divine breathings of St. John; to see in the *Gospel according to Kossuth* the likeness, to hear in it the echo of that glorious creed for which the martyrs and confessors suffered in ancient times: how shall we rightly characterize an infatuation so monstrous as this, or how shall we explain it so as to save the honor and credit of the cause that could be carried away by it to so lamentable an extent! Alas, the religious spirit of the age, as it reigns generally in our evangelical sects, could not have been thus egregiously imposed upon by so transparent a falsehood, (the demon of radicalism in such gossamer guise,) if it were not itself deeply and sadly infected with the power of the same lie. This is the portentous meaning of the transaction, which it well becomes every thoughtful mind to lay seriously to heart; and it is for the lesson it carries in it under such view, that I have considered it proper to hold it up for contemplation on the present occasion. May you be able to understand it well, and to bear it hereafter properly in recollection.

If you would understand your duty to the world, and be able to live for it to any purpose in your generation, it is necessary, first of all, that you should cultivate a firm and steady faith in the reality of its supernatural relations, and have regard continually to the destiny of man as formed for a higher state of existence. The great error of the age consists just in this, that it is not willing to acknowledge these relations except in a simply nominal way, and is led thus to ascribe to merely natural interests and secular ends, as connected with human life, an importance which does not belong to them in fact. This is done to a great extent in the name of religion itself; which is then always confounded more or less with zeal for such subordinate purposes and aims, while its own proper ends are in the same degree thrown into the shade. But no estimation of interests which belong only to this world, can ever be according to truth, or deserve to be relied upon practically, which is not conditioned by an active regard at the same time to the eternal destiny of men as that which is for them of supreme account. Nay, such lower interests, we may say, thus dissociated in thought from man's chief end, become in fact themselves false, take the form not unfrequently of demoniacal delusions, and are entitled to no enthusiasm whatever. Nothing can be more hollow and fallacious, for this reason, than

much of the declamation we hear about education, useful knowledge, liberty, free institutions, and the right of self-government, as though such privileges in the order of nature were to be regarded as in and of themselves the first thing needful for humanity, or might be allowed to rule and control the idea of its destiny in every higher view. Learn to hold all such declamation at its true value. Learn to distinguish well here, between the wisdom which comes from above, and that which is only from beneath. Have courage to see and own the truth. Socialism is not Christianity. It is not the design of the Gospel to subvert thrones and create republics. Secular ends are of just and right force, only as they are held in practical subordination to such as are supernatural and eternal; and they fall over necessarily to the dominion of Satan, the god of this world and the father of lies, wherever this proportion ceases to be observed. The smallest measure of faith is of more value, than any amount of useful knowledge. Education is no blessing, but only a curse to society, if it be not based upon religion, and animated throughout by the sense of its supreme authority in some positive form. Godless schools and colleges, Godless arts and sciences, as well as Godless political and social institutions generally, carrying in them a relation simply to the present world and its wants, and virtually ignoring the claims of another, deserve the abhorrence, and should excite the apprehension and fear of all good men. Not to see and feel all this, is itself a species of infidelity, which opens the way for the very worst disorders and mistakes. It is to set the natural practically above the supernatural; which is to deny in fact the reality of the last altogether. It is to make humanity in and of itself, as it now stands, sufficient for its own ends; which is such a lie as overthrows the whole Gospel, and necessarily turns into caricature all truth besides, by forcing it into false relations and proportions. Hence the universal affinity in which this style of thinking is found to stand with all sorts of rationalistic speculation, sectarian fanaticism, radicalism, socialism, and wild revolutionary republicanism of the most openly anti-christian stamp. Here we have in truth the veritable *Antichrist* of the present age. Learn to know him, and to be aware of his devices. If you are to live wisely for your generation, it will depend much, very much, on this one counsel well kept in mind.

Finally, to return again in conclusion, to what is more directly personal in the application of our theme, let me exhort

you all to be true to your own proper destination, by seeking first, each one of you, for himself, the kingdom of God and his righteousness. As it was said once by a distinguished artist, to account for the pains he took with his work, *I paint for eternity*; so let it be your care also, to live seriously and earnestly, not for the world, which is now rapidly passing away, but for that which is to come. Look not at things which are seen and temporal, but at things which are not seen and eternal. Lay yourselves out to know God, to serve Him in the Gospel of his Son Jesus Christ, and to enter at last into the rewards of his heavenly kingdom. Do not count yourselves unworthy of eternal life. Let no man take from you your crown—the crown of glory and immortality to which you are called by the Gospel, and which has been purchased for you by the death and resurrection of the Son of God. Here is an object worthy of your highest ambition and most active zeal, in comparison with which the most dazzling visions of glory in this world are of as little worth as so much dust or chaff. Let it not be to you as a tale only that is told, or as an empty dream. Seek to have firm faith in the grand and glorious mysteries of the Christian Creed, as realities which are to you of infinitely greater account than all events and facts besides. Be not satisfied, in a case of such unutterable consequence, with faint impressions and feeble purposes and aims. Meditate on your own supernatural destiny. Think much of the vanity of the world, the shortness of life, the certainty of death, and the solemn retributions of the world to come. It has been well said, that the thought of eternity, brought home to the soul from day to day, is for every man the thought of all thoughts, which, if it do not make him wise, must show him to be mad. It is a whole volume of wisdom compressed into a single word. Read it much, I charge you, and study it well. Read it especially in the light of the simple, but unspeakably sublime annunciation: “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” Read it through the living commentary of that illustrious cloud of witnesses, apostles, prophets, martyrs, confessors, saints of all ages and climes, whose faith has already received its reward and who now from their heavenly seats look down upon you with unceasing interest, and kindly beckon you to follow them in the path by which they have been themselves conducted to eternal glory. Read it above all at the foot of the Cross, where in the person of

Him who is the Truth and the Life, nailed upon it, crowned with thorns, covered with his own blood, and overwhelmed with reproach and contempt, the true sense of this world and the true sense of the next, the nothingness of the one and the infinite importance of the other, are brought into view as they could be by no representative besides. "Consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners" and "arm yourselves likewise with the same mind," that you may run the race of life with faith and patience to its proper goal, and receive at last the victor's palm and crown. "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap: for he that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting."

ART. III.—A VISIT TO THE DESERT AND THE DEAD SEA.

The whole land thereof is brimstone, and salt, and burning, that it is not sown, nor beareth, nor any grass groweth therein, like the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeböim, which the Lord overthrew in his anger and in his wrath.—DEUT. xxix. 23.

Having spent the Easter week at Jerusalem, and the ensuing fortnight in visiting the antiquities of the Holy City and its environs, we were informed that a large party of travelers and pilgrims was forming with the intention of making an excursion to the Dead Sea and Jericho.

We gladly accepted the offer to join company with the American Missionaries, Rev. Dr. Lanneau, Dr. John B. Adger, of Charleston, S. C., Dr. de Forrest and their families, embracing thus the opportunity to visit, in perfect safety and pleasant society, those celebrated and highly interesting regions. We therefore instantly ordered saddle-horses and sumpter-mules, and made the necessary preparations for departure.

Wednesday, April 17th, 1844, the caravan assembled at noon, outside the Yafa-gate, where, on our arrival at the place of rendezvous, we met with a troop of twenty Turkish horsemen, whom the Pasha had sent as an escort. Their dress and arms were those of the Bedouins, and they were mounted on

fine and powerful steeds. A multitude of the Arab population of Jerusalem, had quartered themselves around us, to be present at the departure of the Frank pilgrims. At one o'clock, P. M., our party being assembled, and a large number of other pilgrims, horsemen as well as pedestrians, having joined us, we at last departed for the desert.

Passing along the valley of Gihon, we turned beneath Mount Zion into the valley of Ben Hinnom, and, leaving the fountain of Siloam on our left, soon reached the Ain-Rogel in the valley of the Kidron, through which we now continued our course in a southern direction. It was a beautiful, clear day, but very warm in the deep, narrow dell, surrounded by steep hills. The vineyards ceased suddenly below Ain-Rogel; but green corn-fields were still found in the valley and the rocks on both sides had artificial terraces covered with wheat and barley. Soon the mountains became totally barren, and but a few patches of cultivated land were seen now and then along the dry and stony bed of the Kidron.

Turning eastward and leaving the valley behind us, we ascended the mountains in the desert of Judah, from which we had a distant view of Jerusalem, thence appearing in all its desolation as "the city of the wilderness."

On the narrow path winding along the barren rocks, the straggling line of our caravan offered a very picturesque sight. Some Arab horsemen and the Frank travelers with their dragomans formed the van-guard, then came the *mukharieh* or muleteers, with the sumpter-mules and the pedestrian pilgrims, and another troop of Turks closed up the rear. We descended a second time to the valley of the Kidron, which, after taking a southern bend, turns eastward towards the Dead Sea; and suddenly we found ourselves in a pass encompassed by high and steep mountains, at one hour's ride from the Convent of Mar Sabas. On the southern ridge we discovered numbers of Bedouins riding to and fro; they set up a shout or yell, and dismounting and leading their horses by the bridle, they, to our utter astonishment, clattering and rattling among the loose stones, descended, or rather slid down along the apparently very steep side of the mountain toward the pass. Shots were now fired in all directions and a very lively scene began.

The Turkish troopers in the rear spurred their horses and hurried full gallop to the van; the travelers kept close together and loaded their pistols and guns, while the muleteers brought up the mules with great alacrity in order to keep pace with us.

As soon as the Bedouins arrived at the bottom of the valley, they mounted their horses, united with their companions on foot, who came springing down the rocks like goats, from all sides, and began the fire.

But it proved to be only a sham-fight and no serious attack. The seventy or eighty armed Arabs, who attempted to stop us in the pass, belonged to the tribe Taamirah, who at the time had pitched their camp on the hills eastward of Bethlehem. They were at peace with the Turkish government at the time; and came in this war-like style to demand a present or bakhshish for the unmolested passage, and to offer their services to the travelers. In case we had been few and unarmed, we should certainly have lost our tents and baggage. But as they found us with an escort and well prepared to receive them, a short parly soon settled the affair, and the whole caravan, with the Bedouins hovering around it, slowly advanced toward the Convent. On turning round a precipitous rock, we had before us a road in good repair, with a stone parapet on the left, toward the steep descent to the valley of Kidron; and at the distance of half a mile we beheld a high tower on the southern ridge, and soon another massive turret made its appearance on the steep brink above the valley, forming the *keep* or stronghold of the convent, the walls of which descend from one terrace to another along the offsets of the mountain down to the dell. The whole mass of castellated walls with towers and battlements, presents the picture of an old baronial castle of the middle ages. The Bedouins hurrying forward, set up their usual clamor: *Ateni el-chabs*, "give us some bread," and squatted down crosslegged on the rocks opposite the convent, with their fire-locks resting on their laps.

We descended a winding road to the low iron gate of the upper range of the walls; but the Greek monks from the battlements called out to us in Arabic, to continue our descent to the lower terrace, where we dismounted and the English gentlemen sent their dragoman with letters of introduction from the Greek vicar in Jerusalem to parley with the friars and ask admittance for the night; still the Greeks refused to let in the travelers, fearing the presence of the Bedouins. The violent gesticulations of the *Kalogeri* from the battlements, and the angry expostulations of the gentlemen below having continued for a while without any satisfactory result, I went to the wall and accosting the Cenobites in their own modern Greek language, told them: that nowhere in Europe or in Asia the Greek

Kalogeri, so well known for their hospitality, ever used to shut their doors against Christian pilgrims, assuring them at the same time that our guard was strong enough to repel any attack of the Bedouins.

The fathers, hearing that Greeks were in the party speaking their own native tongue, instantly offered to open the gate for the "Milordi," but obstinately refused to admit the ladies of the party and the Turkish troopers. In vain I remonstrated with them that ladies and female pilgrims often had obtained permission to occupy the strong square tower lying opposite on the southern hill, and that in consequence it was termed *gynaicopyrgos*, or ladies tower; but the bearded gentlemen opening a trap-board on a pinnacle of the battlements lowered a basket with the letter of the vicar of the Greek convent at Jerusalem, that I might be convinced of the categorical prohibition to lodge women in the convent or yonder tower.

The order was indeed peremptory and we were thus obliged to rest satisfied with the offer made. The English officers and some French pilgrims then entered with their dragomans and left the rest of the party outside. We were now obliged to take care of the ladies, and began to pitch the tents on the lower terrace, close to the walls, while the Turks formed their bivouac at a greater distance.

Evening was setting in; the sun sank behind the western mountains, for a moment illuminating the dark and frowning cliffs around us with a purple glare which soon was followed by the profound obscurity of the night. The Turks and muleteers had lighted their watch fires along the terrace; and sitting around in their striped garments, with their yellow head-gear (*kefieh*) hanging down over their wild and sun-burnt faces, and their glittering arms, their appearance was striking, and formed groups well adapted to the pencil of the painter. We then sat down to supper before the tents; and having engaged four or five Bedouins to accompany us next day to the Dead Sea, the rest of them returned to the mountains, and we passed the night in perfect safety.

Early next morning I visited the convent. It is built on the southern brink of a deep glen, at the bottom of which lies the dry, stony bed of the Kidron. This mossy old structure is surrounded by high battlemented and turretted walls with buttresses of immense strength projecting toward the steep brow of the precipice, which overhangs the valley, while the only avenue to the convent is the winding path descending

from one terrace to another to the above-mentioned iron-grated doors.

Through the upper gate we entered a court-yard, which serves as a stable for the horses and mules of the pilgrims, whence we descended by a flight of broad stairs to the small, neatly paved square below, in the middle of which stands a chapel, containing the tomb of St. Sabas. It is richly ornamented in the Byzantine style. The interior vault of the cupola has a fine ancient mosaic representing the Saviour. The altar, lamps and sepulchre, are kept with a neatness seldom met with in the convents of Greece. Opposite the chapel stands the large church of St. John of Damascus, which has been rebuilt within a few years with great splendor, and we were highly astonished, here in the midst of the dreary desert, to find a magnificent Greek church, adorned with gilt mosaics, Byzantine paintings, silver lamps and vari-colored marbles. The monks led us to the most ancient oratory in the grotto of St. Sabas, where, in a deep niche, behind a lattice, are seen heaps of mouldering skulls and human skeletons, belonging to some hundreds of monks and hermits, who, according to the tradition of the convent, were murdered by the Saracens, in their dwellings in the Kidron valley, several centuries ago.

We then returned to the inner court and paid a visit to our companions, the English gentlemen, who had left us so abruptly the evening before to pass a comfortable night at the convent. We found them at breakfast in the snug little parlor carpeted and cushioned in the manner of the orient, where guests of distinction are lodged. From the window, we had a wide and most dreary view of the high, frowning rocks and innumerable grottoes of the valley of the Kidron; the eye follows all the sinuosities of the gloomy dell, but distant ridges cut off the prospect of the Dead Sea.

Among the Greek friars attending the British pilgrims at the table, I met with a handsome young priest, Papa Karalambos by name, who spoke his native language more correctly than is generally the case with the Greek monks in Palestine, and who took a good deal of interest in the recent political movements of Greece, of which he appeared to be well informed. He was a Macedonian, who had been educated in one of the numerous monasteries of Mount Athos—*Agion Oras*—and afterwards passed several years in the convent of Mar Sabas. He accompanied me to the eastern terrace, whence we descended by a flight of stairs to the cave, wherein, according to tra-

dition, St. Saba, during his meditations, was surprised by a gigantic lion, who suddenly made its appearance, but retired without molesting the holy man. No fountain is to be met with, neither in the convent nor in the environs, but it is copiously provided with large and deep cisterns, which with extraordinary expense, have been sunk in the rocks and carefully vaulted over; the water is cool and salubrious. At the time of our visit, only thirty-six Kalogeri inhabited the convent, but more than two hundred might be quartered and provided for. Numerous cells are cut in the rock and flights of stairs lead from one story to another. The monks of St. Sabas distinguish themselves by order and cleanliness; they have a certain exterior dignity and a grave deportment, which will be sought for in vain in other monasteries in Greece. They likewise seem to be rather industrious in their seclusion. With the earth from the valley beneath they fill their artificial terraces on the rocks, and thus form garden-beds which are daily watered and cultivated with different beautiful flowers and shrubs, such as *Melia Azedarah*, whose fine violet flowers we saw in full bloom, and a variety of vegetables, constituting the principle dish on the table of Greek monks, who, according to their rule, never eat meat. They offered us a breakfast *a la grecque*, consisting of salad (*maruli*), onions and other herbage, white bread and the strong wine from the valley of St. John in the desert.

A terrace leads up to a slender wooden tower used as a bell-fry,* from the top of which, I had a melancholy view of the sombre, phantastical rocks, on all sides encompassing this abode of the desert. The stony valley of the Kidron forms a brook only during the rainy season in winter. It lies more than two hundred feet below the convent. The caverns and grottoes along the steep northern ridge were inhabited by thousands of hermits during the fifth and sixth centuries of our era. On the South and West are seen the watch-tower and the walls with immense buttresses edging the precipices—and within, the irregular terraces, courts, cells, chapels and the church of St. John form a view which is as picturesque as it is singular, and beyond the power of description.

It was a gray, lowering morning; the Eastern winds had

* The Christian churches and convents in Turkey have no bells, but use instead of them metal plates (*simantra*.) The only monasteries, which enjoy the privilege to toll with clocks, are the Greek convents on the promontory of Athos in Macedonia and the Syrian convent Canobin, on Mount Lebanon, where the patriarch resides. *

brought up the mists of the Asphaltic lake, which were now hanging on the surrounding peaks and enveloped the horizon with a dim, hazy veil. I never beheld a more dismal and colorless landscape, than the dark brown rocks, the sallow walls and buildings, the gloomy glen and the lead-colored sky here presented. Neither trees nor bushes are seen, except a lonely palm-tree rearing its beautiful crown near the bellfry. Nor was there any trace of animal life, save an eagle sailing high above the valley, and spying the numerous pigeons, now inhabiting the caves of the ancient martyrs.

The poor Kalogeri live in a continual feud with the Bedouins of the desert, and are often exposed to their attacks. Even as late as 1834, during the insurrection against Ibrahim-Pasha, the Arabs found an opportunity of surprising the monastery, where they pillaged the stores, and committed many depredations. Since then greater care is taken, and a sentinel, continually relieved from among the fathers, has his stand on the high watch-tower in the South West, whence the view extends over the surrounding wilderness. The opposite tower in the South East, standing on a high rock, (where female pilgrims sometimes are quartered,) was formerly considered as a strong out-work, defending the principal entrance of the convent. When the Arabs, driven by hunger, besiege the cloister, loaves of a coarse bread, kept in store for the purpose, are thrown out to them from the battlements.

Deir Mar Sabas is often mentioned in the earlier times of ecclesiastical history. Towards the middle of the fourth century, the monk Hilarion from Egypt introduced the monastic rule in Palestine, where the enthusiasm for the secluded, ascetic life soon became general, and began to people the wilderness with Anchorites. St. Sabas was the first recluse in the valley of the Kidron. He was born in the village Mutalascas, near Cæsarea in Cappadocia, A. D. 438.† His father, Conon, having a command in the Isaurian troops, went in service to Alexandria, and the young Sabas retired early to a monastery, where he distinguished himself by his religious studies and the austerity of his discipline. As a youth he came to Jerusalem and lived afterwards in a cave in this valley, where a multitude of pilgrims soon settled around him, attracted by his unblemished character and the virtuous course of his life. Having been ordained presbyter by the patriarch of Jerusalem in the year 491, he united the hermits in the *Laura* or communion,

† Cyrill. Seyth. Vita Sabæ in Cotelieri Monum. Eccles. Græc. vol. ii.

which still bears his name.† Sabas was very active; on a hill in the North East, where he discovered ancient vaults, he instituted a convent and a church, and acquired corn-fields and vineyards at Jericho. He extended and fortified his Laura in the valley of Kidron with walls and towers, built, with the assistance of his two brothers, who were clever architects, the ancient church of our Lady, in the grotto, excavated tanks and reservoirs, established a hospital for pilgrims, near the castle of David, in Jerusalem, and received a great number of Syrian and Armenian monks. But he did not long enjoy the benefit of his indefatigable activity. The spirit in the oriental monasteries during that age, where Syrians, Greeks and Armenians lived together, was turbulent and seditious. Violent dissensions arose and an open rebellion broke out in the Laura against the energetical and austere Sabas. He yielded to the storm and withdrew to the valley of Hieromax, near Gadara, where he dwelt some time as a hermit, and a report was spread that he had been devoured by the lions. On his being reinstated in his monastery by the patriarch of Jerusalem, Elias, sixty of the most turbulent monks, destroying his tower and oratory and committing many acts of violence, retired to the hill Tekoa, S. E. of Bethlehem, where they built a new Laura; but the feuds and religious controversies among the monks of the desert, continued for many years after the death of Sabas. He died in A. D. 532, during the reign of Justinian the I., and was interred at the chapel in the cloister-alley, where, according to tradition, he had the vision of a fire-column descending from heaven. His sepulchre, however, is a cenotaph for his bones which were afterwards transported to Rome.

The impulse being thus given to his excrescence of religious life in the east, monachism spread like wild-fire over all Syria and Palestine. In the gloomy valley of the Kidron many thousands of coenobites lived together in the grottoes on the precipitous mountains which extend down to the Dead Sea. Dangerous mountain-paths, or steps, cut out in the smooth lime-stone rock, lead up to them. The interior often contains niches or by-rooms and other traces of earlier inhabitation, like the troglodytic dwellings in the Waddy Hamam near Tiberias and in the Val d'Ispica on Sicily.

† *Laura* signifies properly a lane or alley, where the hermits dwelled in the caves and grottoes around. In a later period, living together in the same dwelling according to a strict monachal discipline, it was called coenoby or monastery. These monasteries were introduced during the reign of Theodosius the II. by Pachymius.

Neither the seclusion nor the poverty of those harmless solitaries could protect them against the depredations of the roving Saracens. During the war between the Persian king Cosroes the II., and Byzantine emperor Heraclius, while the Persian army besieged Jerusalem in the year 614, the convent of St. Sabas was surprised and pillaged by a swarm of Saracens.* The greatest part of the monks saved themselves by flight; but forty-four of the more devout, who could not be persuaded to abandon the sanctuary, were tortured and then slaughtered by the Arabs, and their relics were afterwards solemnly interred by the patriarch Modestus. The festival of the forty-four martyrs is still celebrated through all the Orient on the 15th of May.

At eight o'clock in the morning, April 11th, our large company again assembled on the terrace before the convent, while our dragomans struck the tents and made everything ready for departure. The Monks had told us, that there were two different roads from Deir Mar Sabas to the Dead Sea and Jericho. The one continues for a while through the valley of the Kidron, then following along the western cliffs, it descends on the north of the promontory el-Feshkah to the fountain of the same appellation, Ain el-Feshkah on the N. W. coast of the Dead Sea. This path, though the most picturesque, is longer and more rough than the second through the pass of Kuneiterah, generally used by the monks and pilgrims. The muleteers, therefore, declared it to be impossible, with so heavy a baggage and so large a company, to undertake this dangerous roundabout way, which was chosen only by the light Bedouin horsemen. I then proposed that some gentlemen, who were well mounted, accompanied by a few Turks, might undertake the interesting excursion along the cliffs, and the rest of the party with the mules, strike into the more commodious road North, through the mountains; in the afternoon we might unite again on the shores of the Dead Sea, and thence return to our night quarters at Jericho. But this was objected to by the Turkish troopers, who asserted that the marauding Bedouins rendering the road unsafe, the company could not be permitted to separate, and they had been ordered by the Pasha in Jerusalem to take us along the pilgrim-road to Jericho. The proposition was

* *Ismaelitae ad nostrum accesserunt monasterium, una septimana antequam sancta civitas fuisset occupata; vide: le Quien Oriens Christ. Vol. iii. page 259.* The church of Ascension on Mount Olivet, which had been burnt down by the Persians, was restored by the patriarch Modestus in A. D. 615.

thus abandoned and the whole caravan, now consisting of some eighty persons, passed for a while up the Kidron, then crossing its dry bed we ascended the hills in a N. E. direction. These mountains, undulating like the waves of the ocean, are intersected by deep gullies, which we passed on horseback without any difficulty; but a lady of our party, who being afraid of mounting a pony, had preferred a litter swinging on a mule, suffered very much from the alternate rapid ascents and descents along the ravines and the fearful prospects of the precipice from the narrow path; though the pace of the mules in that country is so sure, that no real danger could be apprehended. This mountainous tract, the desert of Juda, is bare, bleak and dreary, presenting everywhere yellow rocks and gray sand; no trees are seen, a few shrubs grow here and there on the slopes, and the intervening dells, are covered with arid grass and some green bushes of *cistus*. We stopped at an ancient well walled up with stones, an hour's ride from the convent, where the mukkarieh drawing water with their leather-buckets and filling a stone trough at the mouth of the well, watered our thirsty horses. The Arabs called this well Bir-Mousa or the well of Moses, and as there is no well to be found in the valley of Kidron far and near of the convent of Mar Sabas, it occurred to me that it might be the Heptastomon or seven-mouthed well, mentioned in the life of Sabas by Cyrillos, being fifteen stadia from the Laura on the Kidron, and that the convent be built on the hill Kastellion might have been situated in the neighborhood, on the direct road to Jericho.

Another conjecture I will venture, is, that this Bir-Mousa may be the En-Shemesh, (Well of the Sun) mentioned in the Scriptures. The border between Benjamin and Juda went up north toward Gilgal and south to En-Shemesh, whence it was continued to Ain-Rogel. In another place it is stated, that the border in a contrary direction, from West to East, through the valley of Ben Hinnom to Ain-Rogel, "was drawn from the North (running southward) and went forth to En-Shemesh."* Thus it appears to be evident that the border of the tribes of Benjamin and Juda left Gilgal (S. E. from Jericho) in the North and went along the western mountains of the Ghor on the ancient road, which is still used between Jericho and St. Sabas, to the Bir-Mousa, and then followed the valley of the Kidron to Ain-Rogel and the valley of Ben Hinnom.

* Josh. 15: 7. *cf.* 18: 16-17.

This elucidation of the Hebrew text, in perfect conformity with the topography of the valley of the Kidron and of the Bir-Mousa, has been approved of by one of the ablest commentators on Scriptural antiquities, Professor Hermanson, of the University of Copenhagen, and is corroborated by the opinion of Rev. Dr. E. Robinson, who, in his classical work on Palestine supposes the En-Shemesh to have been either the fountain of the Apostles below Bethany or the fountain near the convent of St. Sabas.*

From the heights above Bir-Mousa, we for the first time had a distant view of the Dead Sea and the towering mountain ridge beyond it in el-Belka, the ancient Moab. Beneath us a level table-land extended eastward, sinking down toward the steep, precipitate cliffs, skirting the western shore of the lake, the highest of which is the prominent Ras el-Feshka. The sky had been clouded in the morning, but now it began suddenly to clear up and the warm and glowing coloring diffused a marvellous splendor over the dusky rocks around us, while the deep mirror of the Dead Sea lay glittering in the East. On the northern hills toward Jericho we distinguished the white cupola of the Veli Neby-Mousa or sepulchral chapel of the prophet Moses, where, according to a curious Moslem tradition, Moses is supposed to be buried. Not far off on the East a heap of ruins was visible on a conical hill, but we had no time to divert from our course for their examination. From the lower terrace of the dreary table land, we now descended to the pass of Kureiterah. This defile winds along a mile or two, encompassed by high chalky hills, partly covered with arid grass and stunted bushes, having a deep glen on the left of the path and opens upon the plain of the Jordan. All at once the mountains recede and the most beautiful view presents itself upon the northern coast of the Dead Sea, bounded by the high mountains of Moab, upon the broad *Ghor*, or valley of the Jordan and the river, which at this distance is discernible by the green stripe of thickets and groves, overgrowing its banks down to its discharge in the lake.

The pilgrim-road runs North along the western mountains toward Jericho and Jordan; we therefore dispatched the muleteers with the baggage, accompanied by some Turkish troopers, directly for the famous fountain of Elisha, where we intended to encamp for the night, while the whole mounted party, ladies

* Biblical Researches in Palestine. Boston: 1841, Vol. I, page 493.

and gentlemen, turned their horses' heads in a south-easterly direction and gaily spurred away for the Dead Sea. Descending from the pass along the broad slope toward the shore, the huge wild crags of the precipitous Ras el-Feshkah rose more than a thousand feet above the lake and though the eye of the wanderer does not discern any habitation, nor any human being within its ken, still the plain now assumes a less wild and dreary appearance. We passed through thickets of accasias, tamarisks, and a low tufted tree with a fruit like the sorb apple of Italy and Greece, which afforded a momentary refreshment to the fatigued travelers, who had now been more than five hours on horseback beneath an almost burning sun. In these groves we remarked the beautiful fruit of the *Solanum sanctum*, which by the Swedish naturalist, Mr. Berggren, and others, is supposed to be the apples of Sodom, about which Josephus the historian, in his poetical and exaggerated description, says: "that resembling eatable fruits in color, on being gathered with the hands, they are dissolved into smoke and ashes." This fruit resembles a small round apple: it has a delicate lemon-colored peel and is filled with small black kernels.*

The part of the plain through which we were riding, is often mentioned in Scripture and termed "the wilderness of Judah," which extended along the western shore of the Dead Sea, the plain of Jordan and the mountains of Judah toward Jerusalem and Jericho. During the rebellion of Absalom, David on his flight from Jerusalem crossed the Kidron and withdrew to the banks of the Jordan and said: "I will tarry in the plain of the wilderness;" but not being secure there he passed over Jordan to gather his army in Gilead.† From the description of Josephus, it appears that this region between Jericho and the Asphaltic lake was then as stony and barren as it is now.

At one o'clock, P. M., we arrived on the North shore of the lake, one hour's ride West of the mouth of Jordan, and we plainly recognized the long, low tongue of land, that runs out into the Sea on the western side of its embouchure. All along the eastern coast rises an uninterrupted table-land, the mountain-ridge, termed Pisgah in the Scriptures. This, as seen here from the sea shore does not present any detached peak,

* Berggrens Resor, Stockholm: 1826-28, vol. ii. append. page 69. Different opinions prevail about the apples of Sodom, vide: *Biblical Researches of Rev. Dr. Robinson*, vol. ii., page 235 et seq.

† II. Sam. 15: 23, 28. 16: 2. 17: 16, 22.

projecting from the nearly level line of the highland, that might be considered as "Mount Nebo, the top of Pisgah over against Jericho," where Moses died. The general coloring of the landscape was a ruddy brown or violet, relieved by dark blue streaks, the reflection of the azure sky, indicating the deep dells or chasms, overgrown with a rich and exuberent vegetation, running down to the shore. The height of this eastern chain of mountains exceeds two thousand feet. Quite different and much wilder and sterner is the character of the western cliffs from a height of 1500 feet overhanging or sinking precipitously down into the sea and running out into far projecting capes. The nearest of the promontories is the above mentioned Ras el-Feshkah. More distant appears Ras el-Mersed, behind which is situated Ain-Jidy. Southward the unbounded level of the sea lay expanded before us, as the southern coast is very low and the more distant mountains, receding toward the Idumæan desert, could not be seen from our point of view, being hid by the promontory of el-Mersed.

The shores are sandy and strewn over with pebbles, and gravel. Every where are seen blackened trunks and branches of trees, which the Jordan has carried down into the sea and the waves washed up on the sands. Along the strand extends a thicket of tamarisks, willows and high cane-brake, forming dense hedges around the fountains, which take rise near the coast.

The dark-green lake, the distant violet mountains and the clear, deep-blue sky combined together in a most romantic and highly colored picture, and it was but the heavy dash of the sluggish waves on the beach and the disagreeably bitter saltiness of the water, that reminded us of our gazing on the Sea of Malediction and of Death.*

From the times of remote antiquity down through the middle ages, so many wonders have been fabled about the wild, inanimate scenery of this lake, about its uninhabitable shores, its dangerous exhalations, and the sulphurous vapors, wherein this infernal pool was supposed eternally to be enveloped, that the traveler might well be willing to imagine it to be situated in the profound crater of an immense volcano, surrounded by all the horrors of nature. He will, therefore, feel a pleasant disappointment, when from the tamarisk grove on the northern

* During the middle ages the Salt Sea was termed *mare maledictum*, and *mare diaboli*. The Arabs still call it *Sah'r el-Lut*: the sea of Lot.

shore he contemplates a magnificent lake, the scenery of which, as to the variety of its colors and the grandeur of its outlines presents one of the finest views he ever saw.

At the time of our visit no exact admeasurements of the sea had been published, though it appears that English engineers in 1841 had taken a military survey of all Palestine. The length of the sea is generally given approximately at forty miles and its breadth from ten to twelve miles, which it retains for the greater part of its length. On the North West it is somewhat narrowed by the projecting promontory el-Feshkah; and on the South East the chalky mountains of Moab form a large peninsula having twelve miles in length and eight in breadth. This peninsula and the southern coast, the salt-plain, is inhabited by an Arab tribe, which has other settlements on the eastern coast and in the valley of the Jordan on the North. On the precipitous western shore, was situated in ancient times the city of En-Gaddi, mentioned by St. Jerome as a large borough in his days, and the Arabs still possess gardens and cultivated fields around the copious fountain Ain-Jidi, (the goat spring,) which bursts forth beneath the picturesque and historically interesting defile of Ziz. Farther North are several fountains surrounded by a luxuriant vegetation. The banks of the Jordan are covered with thickets of trees and reeds, nor do the glens of the Moabite mountains on the East appear to be less verdant, though the shores are almost unknown. These facts plainly demonstrate, that the coasts of the Dead Sea, are inhabited and not devoid of all vegetable life. Fishes do not live in it; snails, muscles and other shell-fish are brought down by the Jordan, and the great distance at which they are found from the edge of the water, denotes the extraordinary vehemence of the storms that convulse the sea during the winter season. Numerous flights of birds lodge in the crags near the springs and in the tamarisk grove on the northern coast, and fly boldly across the lake; swarms of locusts from the plain attempt it in vain and sometimes find their death in the waves. The few insects we saw appeared languid and crept feebly along among the jungles.

The two mountain chains, that on the East and West encompass the Dead Sea, are of a calcareous formation. On the Bazar before the church of the Resurrection at Jerusalem, an American merchant showed me, among other curiosities from the Sea, some pretty goblets of a black basalt, which he said came from the rocks of En-Gaddi, but this was perhaps an in-

vention, in order to attach higher importance to his merchandise, no modern traveler having yet found basaltic stones in the environs of the lake. At many places is seen an ash-colored lime, mixed with salt and nitre, stones covered with a white salt-crust, and large heaps of stones with layers of bitumen chalk and flint, covered over with crystalized salt; near these grow patches of salt-plants, such as *salsola* and *solicornia*. At the Tank of Abraham (Birket el Khulil) on a shallow bay, beneath the western precipices the brine from the lake evaporates and deposits a solid surface of salt, which the Arabs collect, load on their camels, and transport to the tribes of the desert. On the southern salt-plain rises the interesting mountain-ridge of Uzdum, with beautiful precipices of pure crystalized fossil salt. Large lumps of sulphur are found along the coast, particularly in the neighborhood of the fountains. On the eastern bank, north of the peninsula, the ancient hot sulphur springs of Kallirrhoe are still used by the Arabs, who call them the baths of Moses, David and Solomon. Bitumen (asphaltum) from the sub-marine slime-pits, rises in huge masses, on the surface of the southern parts of the lake, particularly after earthquakes, and is cut up and sold by the Bedouins at the ports of the Mediterranean.*

In the valley of the Jordan, and on the shores of the Dead Sea, a tropical climate prevails, which, during the heat of summer, is very unhealthy, and causes frequent fevers; in consequence of which, the Arabs inhabiting the environs of the lake, look pale and sickly. The deep depression of the lake, walled up by high, parched cliffs, in so torrid a climate, must necessarily occasion an extraordinary ebullition and exhalation of vapors; still we find a great deal of exaggeration in the marvellous reports of the ancient pilgrims and crusaders about the pestiferous evaporations of the sea. From the Mount of Olives I have often beheld the sea enveloped in mists, particularly dense during the morning, and the Greek monks at the convent of St. Sabas likewise declared the light clouds that hung over the valley on the morning of our visit, as rising from the salt sea, adding at the same time, that these morning mists, though frequent during spring and summer, do not carry any pernicious vapors along with them, and therefore, in the abstract, do not exercise any detrimental influence on the atmosphere of these regions.

* See the interesting particulars in Rev. Dr. Robinson's *Biblical Researches*, vol. ii. page 228 et seq.

The traveler, in his descent of seven hours, from the height of Jerusalem, to the shores of the Dead Sea, is astonished at the steep declivity of the mountains, and the sudden change of the temperature in the plain. It has, therefore, long been admitted, that the Valley of the Jordan and the Sea lay deeply depressed between the two mountain-ridges, emerging from Mount Hermon on the Anti-Lebanon; but it was not until the year 1837, that English and German naturalists, by repeated thermometrical and barometrical observations made the important discovery of the deep depression of this region beneath the level of the Mediterranean. This was confirmed the following year by the Austrian geologist Russegger, who found the depression of the Dead Sea to be 1300 Parisian feet, and by the exact trigonometrical measurement of the English engineer, Lieutenant Symonds, in 1842, the depression of the Dead Sea has been fixed at 1337, and that of the Lake of Tiberias at 84 feet below the level of the Mediterranean.

The great difference of 1253 feet here stated, which, as it appears, has been ascertained by actual admeasurement of the relative levels of the lake of Tiberias and the Dead Sea, and consequently the extraordinarily rapid descent of the Jordan in the short distance of one degree, or about 70 miles, without exhibiting any cataract or fall, is still doubtful and requires farther elucidation.

From the letters of Lieut. Lynch, quoted by Lieut. Maury, we transcribe the following interesting facts elicited by the exploration:

"The bottom of the northern half of this sea is almost an entire plain. Its meridional lines at a short distance from the shore scarce vary in depth. The deepest soundings thus far 188 fathoms (1128 feet.) Near the shore the bottom is generally an incrustation of salt, but the intermediate one is soft mud with many rectangular crystals—mostly cubes—of pure salt. At one time Stellwager's lead brought up nothing but crystals. The southern half of the sea is as shallow as the northern is deep, and for about one fourth of its entire length the depth does not exceed three fathoms, (18 feet.) Its southern bed has presented no crystals, but the shores are lined with incrustations of salt, and when we landed at Uzdom, in the space of an hour, our foot-prints were coated with crystallization. The opposite shores of the peninsula and the west coast present evident marks of disruption. There are unquestionably birds and insects upon the shores, and ducks are some-

times upon the sea, for we have seen them—but cannot detect any living thing within it; although the salt streams flowing into it contain salt fish. I feel sure that the results of this survey will fully sustain the scriptural account of the cities of the plain."

He thus speaks of Jordan: "The Jordan, although rapid and impetuous, is graceful in its windings and fringed with luxuriance, while its waters are sweet, clear, cool, and refreshing."

After the survey of the sea, the party proceeded to determine the height of mountains on its shores, and to run a level thence via Jerusalem to the Mediterranean. They found the summit of the west bank of the Dead Sea more than 1000 feet above its surface, and very nearly on a level with the Mediterranean.

"It is a curious fact," says Lieut. Maury, "that the distance from the top to the bottom of the Dead Sea should measure the height of its banks, the elevation of the Mediterranean, and the difference of level between the bottom of the two seas, and that the depth of the Dead Sea should be also an exact multiple of the height of Jerusalem above it."

Another not less singular fact, in the opinion of Lieut. Lynch, "is that the bottom of the Dead Sea forms two submerged plains, an elevated and a depressed one. The first, its southern part, of slimy mud covered by a shallow bay; the last, its northern and largest portion, of mud and incrustations and rectangular crystals of salt—at a great depth with a narrow ravine running through it, corresponding with the bed of the river Jordan at one extremity, and the Wady 'el Jeib,' or wady within a wady at the other."

It has been a favorite hypothesis, often repeated, that the bed of the Salt Sea in the days of the Prophet Abraham formed the fertile plain of Siddim, through which the Jordan flowed, taking its course southward along the large valley el-Arabah, and discharging itself in the Ælantic gulf of the Red Sea. Furthermore, that the Salt lake was formed in consequence of the sinking of the vale of Siddim at the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. The latest discoveries, however, demonstrate not only, that the Jordan and the Dead Sea lie considerably deeper than the Arabic gulf, but that the great valley el-Arabah rises high above the Dead Sea by a chain of chalky mountains, which extend from the eastern highland of Edom across the valley westward to the Desert et-Tih, in such a manner,

that only the southern part of the valley el-Arabah and its collateral dales send down their streams to the Red Sea, while the larger northern part of it has steep declivity toward the salt plain on the southern shore of the Dead Sea.

Modern travelers, therefore, have supposed that the Jordan, as far back as the present formation of the surface of the earth, must have formed an inland-sea between the mountains surrounding it, but that the lake in that period might have been less extensive, and only reached to the peninsula; that the vale of Siddim with its populous cities and exuberant pasturages occupied the shallow southern coast of the present Salt Sea and the adjacent Ghor, until the Lord in his wrath "rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire—and overthrew those cities, and all the plain and all the inhabitants of the cities and that which grew upon the ground,"* whereby the slime-pits which had undermined the soil were set on fire, a general conflagration ensued, the valley sunk, and the lake breaking forth, covered the whole region with its waters.

Nevertheless there are still more important arguments which prove that this catastrophe was produced by a tremendous *volcanic revolution*, which has given the valley of the Jordan its deep depression below the surface of the Mediterranean, and probably by the same concussions, that lowered the plain, might have raised the precipitous chalk-hills which now run across the southern desert. Many phenomena in this tract point at such a Plutonic overthrow. The extinct volcano near the city of Safed on the north west of the lake of Tiberias, the Basaltic rocks and hot-springs on its borders, the salt-mountain, the springs of sulphur, naptha and asphaltum on the Dead Sea, the overhanging precipices and deep chasms of the rocks toward the lake, and finally the frequent and terrible earthquakes throughout the whole length of the Ghor, sufficiently evince the volcanic nature of this region and produce the clearest evidence of the recorded fact, that this magnificent plain in conformance with the words of the Scriptures, has been submerged beneath the level of the sea.†

A similar phenomenon, which although of less extent and consequence, still illustrates the natural revolution in Palestine, occurred in the year 1819 at Cutch on the Delta of the Indus, where several towns were destroyed, the fortress and

* Gen. 19: 24, 25.

† The cities of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboiim and Zoar "were joined together in the vale of Siddim, which is the salt sea." Gen. 14: 2, 3.

borough of Sindree submerged, and the plain was transformed into an extensive lake, while a hilly ridge, by the natives termed Ullah-Bund or Mound of God, suddenly rose extending for fifty miles in length from East to West across the eastern mouth of the Indus.* The appearance of the salt-mountain of Uzdum (Sodom) on the southwest of the valley, likewise satisfactorily explains not only the Plutonic operation of that event, but also the transmutation of this tract of the Ghor from a fertile plain to a desert and a salt sea.

As to the earlier course of the Jordan, and the formation and natural condition of the southern chalk-hills, different theories have been proposed, which cannot be brought to a conclusive result, until geologists, with perfect personal safety and furnished with all the means for thorough investigations, have traveled over the whole ground from the sources of the Jordan on the Antilibanon through the Ghor in its full extent to Akabah on the Arabic gulf.

On the other hand the supposition, that the submersion of the vale of Siddim might have been produced by the *setting on fire* of the slime-pits or springs of asphaltum and the consequent subterranean conflagration, appears to be contrary to all the observations of the geologists on the nature and condition of the pits of bitumen. These are eminently *water springs*, which carry along with them a quantity of bitumen or fossil pitch very insignificant in proportion to the mass of the water, and though it be combustible, it never can have occasioned those devastating effects. Such is the nature of all the slime-pits hitherto known near Bakoo, and on islands of Zante, Sicily and Trinidad.

Among the five cities embellishing the fine plain of Siddim "well watered like the land of Egypt," Gomorrah—and Sodom, the residence of Lot, must have been situated in the southern part of the present lake; and near to them on the slope of the eastern mountains lay Zoar. Abraham ascending the hills of Hebron looked "toward Sodom and Gomorrah and toward *all the land* of the plain and beheld the smoke of the country arise as the smoke of a furnace."† Lot fled to the neighboring Zoar,‡ where he found a refuge, and his sons became the

* Principles of Geology, by Lyell: London, 1834; vol. ii. page 188, et seq. American edition: Philadelphia, 1837; page 382, et seq.

† Gen. 19: 28

‡ "Behold this city is near to flee unto: O let me escape thither!" And the protecting angel answered: "I will not overthrow this city for the which thou hast spoken." Gen. 19: 20, 21.

progenitors of the Amonites and Moabites of the East-Jordanic kingdoms. The site of Zoar on the peninsula, near the embouchure of the Kerak river, is known with historical certitude, being a garrisoned fortress during the Roman Empire, and afterwards in the times of the crusaders it is often mentioned as *Segor* and *Villa Palmarum*, from the beautiful palm groves surrounding it. §

Our company having dispersed, and for more than an hour wandered along the coast recalling to the memory these recollections of this celebrated sea, we at last sat down on the trunks of the drift-wood, which the waves had washed on shore, and partook of a welcome repast. The water in our leathern bottles being luke-warm and hardly palatable, a basket filled with the odorous oranges of Yafa, which one of our attentive companions now produced, offered us a most excellent refreshment, and it is just here in the desert, far from any fountain, beneath a parching sun, that the traveler fully values the inestimable gift of this delicious fruit. Our Turkish Spahides, in the mean time, began to get impatient of our stay, as we had still a long ride to the Jordan and back to our encampment at Jericho. They spurred to and fro, and brandishing their long carbines they called together the pilgrims with the far-echoing, *yallah, yallah*, (make haste!) We were thus obliged sooner than we intended to leave this interesting spot, and now deeply regretted, that we had not ordered our camp to be pitched on the strand, in order to pass the remaining hours of the day near the sea, and fully to enjoy the admirable sunset and the still more magnificent morning-dawn on its picturesque shores. A bustling scene ensued, and in a few minutes being all in the saddle again, we cantered briskly along the plain, for some distance covered over with a white nitrous crust, that gave way beneath the hoofs of our horses. At half an hour's ride from the sea, we passed through a straggling copse-wood of acacias and other southern trees, descending from the western hills toward the Jordan. Then another level region followed, arid, sandy, and only enlivened by clusters of tamarisks and vitex agnus castus, growing scantily from out the sandy soil.

At a short distance on the West we discovered a ruin, by the Arabs called the tower of Hajla, from the fine copious fountain which bursts forth in the neighborhood, and calling

§ Vide the elaborate and highly interesting researches of Rev. Dr. Robinson; vol. ii. page 648, et seq.

into life far-spreading verdure and bushes, forms an oasis in the wilderness. The situation of this fountain, south of the ancient Gilgal, and its present name, Ain-Hajla, reminds the traveler of the scriptural Beth-Hoglah, placed on the boundary line between the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, which, from the plain of the Jordan, ran south-westward along the mountains to the above mentioned fountain of the Sun (En-Shemesh.) Though the heat was overpowering, we quickened our course, and, in an hour and a half, reached the ruinous monastery of St. John, situated on the upper banks of the Jordan, due East of Jericho. This large and wealthy convent was built before the sixth century, in commemoration of the place where, according to tradition, our Saviour was baptized by St. John. Thousands of pilgrims, through the course of the middle ages, repaired to the hallowed spot, and bathed in the Jordan. The convent was then inhabited by Greek Kalogeri. It withstood all the storms and vicissitudes of the crusading wars, but was burnt and demolished by the Mamelukes in the fifteenth century, and now only a few relics of the outer walls are standing on the high brink overlooking the lower valley of the river. We here descended some thirty or forty feet to the outer bank, covered with straggling poplars, willows, tamarisks, and the fragrant *rishrash* or *vitex agnus castus*, more and more condensing as we approached the river, and at last forming a thick and almost impenetrable wood on its margin, where we dismounted. This lower border of the river, according to the observations of Professor Russegger, lies 1269 Paris feet below the level of the Mediterranean; and here the Latin pilgrims celebrate their mass and bathe on the Tuesday of the Holy Week, while the Greeks and Armenians move farther down towards the Dead Sea.

The Jordan has here a breadth of from eighty to an hundred feet. Its depth was said to be twelve feet, and the nearest ford lies four miles North above Jericho. The current was silent but rapid, and filled the immediate banks to the very brim. In order to facilitate and secure the access to the river, the nearest trees had been felled and the trunks laid across, forming a causeway which proved dangerous to pass on horseback, but was commodious for the pilgrims who might thus fearlessly approach to the edge of the stream.

I felt singularly pleased on finding myself so suddenly reposing in the shade of a fine thick-set forest of high-grown, magnificent trees of the most refreshing verdure, whose boughs

projected far over the river or bathed in its waters, while I formerly had supposed, according to the relations of Chateaubriand and other travelers, that the banks of the Jordan were either sandy and bare, or beset only with reeds and copse. Still the days of Josephus are no more, when beautiful groves of palm-trees "covered the banks of the holy river, and were the more luxuriant and frugiferous the nearer they grew to the water." All the palm-groves are now vanished; they have suffered the same fate with the cities of the plain, having been thrown down and destroyed during the wars, or neglected during the long abandonment of this unhappy region to the roving and lawless tribes of the desert. In the whole wide plain, only one single palm tree rears its melancholy crown over the miserable huts of the modern Jericho.

The grove consists of poplars, tamarisks, and many fine southern trees which were unknown to me. Creepers swinging from one tree to another formed a dense hedge along the river side, above which, at a distance of five miles, rose the violet mountains of el-Belka. This wood-scenery, skirting the borders of the Jordan all along the Ghor, was a remarkable feature, particularly interesting to our American friends, as it reminded them of the still more extensive and impenetrable forests on the banks of their native rivers. The picturesque nerium oleander, by the Arabs called *defle*, with its rosy flowers embellishing all the vallies and water-courses of the Lebanon, we sought for in vain, though other travelers have seen it higher up the river toward the Lake of Tiberias. The heavy showers of the preceding days had occasioned a transient overflowing of the river, which was still visible by the deep loamy mud covering the dike and the lower parts of the adjoining wood. Through this we waded cautiously to the edge of the stream, and filled our leather buckets in the river. It had a yellow clayish color, and did not seem very inviting, but the water was cool and exceedingly refreshing after the sufferings of the day. Our company now dispersed in the wood, and several pilgrims went deeper into the thicket, to bathe in the river.

When Joshua, at the time of harvest, led the army of the Hebrews across the Jordan, the river was full to its banks, such as we found it now.* Whether the passage of the Israelites took place four or five miles higher up at the ford, as some authors have supposed, or at this spot, "right against Jericho,"

* Joshua 3: 15.

as the Scriptures say, does not diminish the deep interest which the wanderer needs must take near the spot celebrated by an event of so great importance in remote antiquity. The Christian tradition has transferred the baptism of our Saviour to this place, though John the Evangelist says, that "it was done at Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing."† From the earliest times of Christianity, therefore, it has been visited by the Pilgrims, and in the seventh century a church was built and the Twelve Stones erected four miles from the river, toward Jericho, on the ruins of the ancient Gilgal, where the Israelites, after their passage, pitched their camp in the land of Canaan.

The Arabs call the Jordan *Sheriah el-Kebir*, "the great water course," and the valley through which it flows from the lake of Tiberias to the Dead Sea and the southern valley beyond it, *el-Ghor*, "the deeply sunk vale between high mountains." The length of the *Ghor* between the two lakes is nearly seventy miles, the upper part of which, as far as Beisan (*Scythopolis*,) has only four miles in breadth, but further down it widens, and near Jericho, where the mountains recede, it forms a plain of nearly twelve miles in width. The river runs along a lower valley situated thirty or forty feet beneath the upper *Ghor*; it has a meandering course, and is frequently confined to a narrow channel by the boldly projecting western mountains. Though it receives several rivers such as the *Yarmuk* and the *Zerka*, from the eastern high-land, it does not considerably augment the mass of its waters. The mountain torrents and scanty fountains all disappear in the *Ghor*, and do not reach the Jordan, except during the heavy showers of the rainy season. The lower valley, and the immediate banks of the river, are clothed with lofty trees and luxuriant vegetation through its whole length. The different fords are well known to the Arabs, and two bridges cross the river near the lake of Tiberias. Its depth varies considerable during the different seasons, and is sometimes in summer so shallow that travelers in the month of July have found the water only three feet deep. *El Ghor* is confined by two parallel chains of barren, chalky mountains, which on the West attain the height of fifteen hundred feet above the valley, while on the East they recede further back, forming the *Moabitic highland* to a height

† John 1 : 28. *Bethbara trans Jordanem, ubi Johannes ad poenitentiam Baptizabat.* Hieronymi *Onomasticon*.

of two thousand five hundred feet. The western border of the Jordan, between Berian and Jericho, being but imperfectly known, because the great caravan-route and consequently all communication from Damascus and the Hauran passes along the eastern bank in el-Belka, Rev. Dr. Eli Smith and Rev. Mr. Calhoun, attempted nearly at the same time of our visit to the Ghor, from Jericho to pass along the western side of the valley as far as the lake of Tiberias; but apprehending an attack from the marauding Bedouins, they were obliged to quit it and strike into the Samarian mountains by the road of Nabulus. Nevertheless, Lord Eastnor and a French traveler, Mr. de Gauchaud, accompanied by a strong detachment of Bedouins, succeeded, a month later, in traversing the river and visiting the beautiful ruins of the ancient city of Gerasa, (Jerash) in Gilead, though they were exposed to the danger of being eye witnesses of a battle between hostile tribes of Bedouins.

The climate of the Ghor is hotter than in any other part of Syria, on account of its deep depression, the steep and barren cliffs compressing and reflecting the heat and cutting off the refreshing breeze from the Mediterranean, which renders the atmosphere so pleasant in the western part of Palestine. The sudden transition from the oppressive summer heat of the Ghor to the cold and unsettled weather on the table-land of Judah, we felt most disagreeably on our return to Jerusalem. For the same reason, the harvest in the Ghor falls nearly a month earlier than on the mountains, the wheat harvest being there in April, while even on the plain of Sharon, near Romleh and Yafa, the grain was hardly ripe on our descent to the Mediterranean in the beginning of May.

The evening was now setting in, and we had still two hours' ride to our night quarters at Jericho. As the whole company could not be united in a hurry, part of us departed, leaving some troopers behind for the security of the absentees. Returning to the upper Ghor, and passing the ruins of the ancient convent of St. John, we continued our course in a western direction toward Jericho. Every trace of the desert soon disappeared. Beautiful groves of vitex agnus castus, acacia, and the thorny nubk (*rhamnus napeca*) succeeded, intermingled with fields of corn and wheat, while the soil was covered with a carpet of sweet-scented flowers. We passed the purling brook descending from the head fountain Ain es-Sultan (the fountain of Elisha,) beneath the hills of Jericho. It separates in several water courses, and fertilizes this charming region in

a circumference of many miles. The poorly dressed and miserable looking inhabitants, men and women from the village of Riha, were working in the fields. Somewhere here in the neighborhood, ten stadia from Jericho, lay the ancient Gilgal, where the Israelites encamped and erected their tabernacle for six years prior to its removal to Shiloh. In Gilgal they celebrated the passover and renewed the covenant of their forefathers with the Lord, and from here Joshua undertook the glorious conquest of the promised land.

The gentlemen we had left behind on the banks of the Jordan now coming up in haste, the Bedouin cavaliers presented us with an imitation of the warlike exercises of the desert. Running full gallop against each other, then firing their carbines or throwing their lances, they quickly wheeled about their steeds and started off as in a flight, but instantly brandishing their scymiters, they returned with the same velocity to renew the attack. This lively and picturesque scene is often seen in the Orient; the Turks throw the jereed with great dexterity, and the skillful horsemanship of the riders, and extraordinary impetuosity and rapid evolutions of the beautiful Arabian steeds are alike admirable, by this imitation of the ancient warfare of the Saracens, which so often proved fatal to the mail-clad Crusaders of the middle ages.

The sun had set, but the mountains in Moab still blazed with the rosy tints of evening, when we approached the village and castle of Riha, embosomed in a grove of fine olive, fig and pomegranate trees, and hemmed in by the impenetrable hedges of nubk and prickly pear. We followed the course of the rivulet and arrived in a quarter of an hour to a delightful meadow, bounded on the West by the precipitous Jebel-Kuruntul, where our men near to the fountain of Elisha, had pitched the tents in a circle beneath the high and shady trees. They had lighted several fires; and the Arab women from the village bringing milk and eggs, our supper was soon ready. I remember this camp scenery near Jericho as one of the most pleasant in Palestine. We took our tea before the tents during a lively conversation about past and present times. It was a warm, quiet evening beneath the serene and starry sky; our horses grazed on the banks of the rivulet; the Arabs sat in groups around the fires, while the Turks were on guard at a greater distance.

At break of day, next morning, I left the camp and followed the course of the rivulet through the wood for a quarter of an

hour, to the castle of Riha. The village lies seven hundrêd and seventy-four feet beneath the level of the Mediterranean,* on the North of Wady Kelt, from the western mountains running down toward the Jordan. Eriha or Riha, as the Arabs call it, by a perversion of the ancient name Jericho, consists only of some twenty miserable, filthy huts, coarsely heaped together of ancient stones with low thatched roofs, strown over with gravel to hold the straw. They are hemmed in by thick hedges of the thorned napeca-tree, wherein the cattle find shelter during the night. The gaunt and sickly villagers, at the time nearly two hundred souls, belong to the Arab tribe inhabiting the eastern and southern shore of the Dead Sea. Their indolence or infirmity does not permit them by their own exertions, to cultivate the fertile country around, and they are obliged to call to their assistance the mountaineers from the hills of Judah, with whom they divide the profit of the harvest. Above the hovels rises an ancient square tower, from the time of the crusades, which the monks of Jerusalem call the House of Zacchæus, where our Saviour found a hospitable reception. The destination of this fortress appears to have been to protect the fine gardens, corn-fields and vineyards of the plain, which was well cultivated during the twelfth century, and yielded an annual revenue of five thousand ducats to the convent of Black nuns at Bethany, to whom Fulco, the Latin king of Jerusalem, granted Jericho in the year 1138.† Pilgrims visiting the plain after the conquest of Jerusalem by the Sultan Salaheddin, in 1187, found the castle in a ruinous state and inhabited by Saracens.

Before the tower I met a guard of armed Albanians. On greeting them with the usual salutation: "*Besa dia besa*" (truce be with you!) I was well received by the wild-looking warriors. Being Mahomedan Scypetars from Scodra in Upper Albania, they wore the loose white camese or kilt (*fustanella*) and the curious high peaked leathern helmet ornamented with *looking glasses* and plated *bandelets*, which gives them such a strange appearance. They had just arrived from Beirut. On our arrival at Jerusalem the city was garrisoned by a Turkish foot regiment of the *askeri muhammoudieh*, or regular army. Soon after, a report being spread of a tumult at Halep in northern Syria, where the inhabitants, dissatisfied with the Turkish governor, and particularly with the new regulations

* According to the observations of Professor Russegger in 1838.

† Vide *Gesta Dei per Francos*. Vill. Tyr. xi. 15.

for a general conscription of the young men called to serve in the army, had revolted and expelled the Turks from the city, the Pasha marched off at the head of the regulars, leaving the gates of the city in the custody of a troop of light-horse and a ridiculous militia of Arab inhabitants, poorly dressed and worse armed. But on a morning in April the city was startled at the appearance of a camp of four hundred Albanian highlanders, pitched on the western hill, near the Yafa gate, like the Roman army of Pompey in the olden time. The peaceable tradesmen of the bazars, fearing the roving habits of the Arnauts, who brought a very bad reputation with them from Beirut, instantly closing their shops, deserted the market place and the Turkish kaimakam or governor of the city, had some difficulty in appeasing them and maintaining the tranquillity of the town.

Near a reservoir in the court-yard of the castle, I found the old Albanian captain, smoking his morning pipe. He spoke the *romaiika* or modern Greek dialect, and told me that he was a Moreote from the Albanian settlement at Lala (in the ancient Ellis of western Peloponnese,) that he had fought against the Greeks, but being expelled during the revolutionary war, had since served in the Turkish army. The garrison consisted of some twenty Albanians, who were sent down to the plain during the harvest to protect the inhabitants and take care of the interest of the Turkish government. The old Pallikar accompanied me to the terrace of the tower, whence I enjoyed a highly gratifying prospect over the valley of the Jordan to the distant mountains and the Dead Sea. Jericho is in the Scriptures often called "the city of the palm-trees," and its surrounding plain has always been considered as the most productive in all Palestine, while Josephus never alludes to it without praising its excellence. "The waters of the fountain," says he, "fertilize the plain, seventy stadia in length and twenty in breadth, and call forth rich and shadowy gardens and palm groves with fruits distilling a juice sweet as honey, of which this country has a great abundance. It produces opobalsam, cyprios, and a variety of noble and rare trees and shrubs. The genial temperature of the air, and the refreshing humidity of the soil, covers the earth with flowers and verdure, fresh and vigorous even during the heat of summer. Winter with its snows never descends on this happy vale, which well deserves to be termed an earthly paradise."* The roses and

* Joseph. Bell. Jud. 4, 8, 3.

sycamore trees of Jericho are likewise mentioned in the Scriptures,* but of all this beauty few traces now remain. I saw a solitary palm tree rising above the dense grove of thorny nubk-trees. The pomegranate and fig trees grow luxuriantly as in other parts of Palestine, and from the fruit of the *zegum* (*elaginus angustifolia*) the Arabs are said to press an oil, which on the bazar at Jerusalem is highly appreciated by the pilgrims as the balm of Jericho, and used as a medicine.

Taking leave of the Moreote warrior, I hurried back and found our company comfortably encamped on the glade beneath the shadowy trees of the fountain, busily occupied with their breakfast. It would perhaps have been difficult to have chosen a more delightful spot. Sir Walter Scott, in his *Talisman*, has transferred the lively scene between Salaheddin and the Scottish knight, and afterwards the interview between Richard Cœur-de-Lion and the Sultan, to this "Diamon of the Desert," as it was appropriately called by the Saracens. If the inimitable romancer had anticipated its cool and pleasant site, its lofty trees and precipitous mountain, he would perhaps have enhanced the dramatic effect he knew so well how to impart to his heroes, by a faithful picture of the magnificent environs. The copious fountain gushes forth on the east side of a mound forming the last offset of a succession of hills descending from the high and steep Jebel Kuruntul toward the plain. The stream is clear, but not cold; it is collected in an ancient tank built up with hewn stones in a semicircular form with niches, few traces of which are now visible. The leafy trees have thrust their mighty trunks and branches through the crevices of the wall and project over the fountain. The brook purls through the forest, separates into many streamlets and covers its banks with a cheerful verdure. *Ain es Sultan* is the ancient renowned fountain of Elisha, about which the Scriptures say, that "the men of Jericho came to the prophet and said: Behold, the situation of this city is pleasant, but the water is nought and the ground barren." Elisha then went to the fountain, threw salt into it and said: "Thus said the Lord, I have healed these waters; there shall not be from them any more death or barren land. So the waters were healed unto this day."† From Josephus we learn, moreover, that the old Canaanitic Jericho was situated near the fountain, probably on

*I am tall as a palm of En-Gaddi and as the rose tree of Jericho. *Sirach*. 24: 15 fr. *Luc*. 19: 4.

† 2 *Kings* 2: 19, 20.

the mounds which, like artificial tumuli, arise at the West, strewn over and covered with rubbish and stones.*

Within a short period after the destruction of Jericho by the Israelites, this fertile region appears to have become inhabited again. So early as the days of the Judges, Eglom the king of Moab, "smote Israel and possessed the city of the palm-trees." It was rebuilt during the reign of King Jehoashaphat, and formed the school of the prophets. During the Roman sway Jericho was a splendid city, and its environs highly cultivated, but being situated southward on the road to Jerusalem, I shall mention its ruins farther on.

On ascending the barren hills above the fountain of Elisha, the traveler is astonished in viewing, at a distance, quite a number of ruins, which at the first glance might well be supposed to have belonged to the ancient Jericho. Westward, on the slope of Mount Quarantana, lies a ruinous castle; farther north several vaulted buildings, and an aqueduct on high arches runs off in a southern direction to Wady Kelt. But this illusion soon vanishes on a nearer examination of the ruins. The Arabs call them Tawahin es-Sukkar, or the sugar mills. They have the character of Saracenic constructions with pointed arches, which like a piazza or corridor encompass a large oblong court-yard. The crusaders, on their advance along the coast of Syria in 1099, found the plains of Tripolis and Tyre cultivated with the sugar cane, a plant at that time unknown in the western world. The Latin historians of the period likewise mention the great abundance of sugar produced in the fertile plain of the Jordan, and the many aqueducts, mills and other structures still testify the industry, which then must have imparted life and activity to this now neglected and desolate region.

The head spring nourishing these aqueducts is Ain-Duk, a copious fountain issuing from a dell on the northern base of Mount Kuruntul, at half an hour's distance from the hills. The water is led along the flank of the mountain in an artificially excavated channel across the hills on the west of Jericho. There the current divides; an aqueduct carries part of it eastward through the Saracenic sugar mills, lying on terraces the one above the other, down to the plain. They are all in a state of dilapidation; from the open arches the water every where

* Joseph. Bell. Jud. I. c. From the Greek text may be inferred that the later Jericho, on account of the curse of Joshua resting on the more ancient city, did not lie on the same spot.

gushes forth, and the most luxuriant vegetation of flowers and shrubs now overshadow those ancient relics of Saracen industry. Only here and there beneath the arches the indolent inhabitants of Riha have laid out some gardens for melons, onions, and other vegetables. The principal aqueduct, however, as before stated, runs in a southern direction, on high, well preserved arches, across Wady Kelt, and still irrigates the plain on the south of the village. I suppose that the artificial channel cut out in the rock, which carries the water from Ain-Duk to the aqueducts on the hill, and even part of these, are a work of antiquity. A few miles north of the hills are found substructions and walls of hewn stones, probably remains of the borough of Neara, (Naaratha,) five Roman miles from Jericho. Josephus, relating the splendid rebuilding of the royal palace at Jericho by the Ethnarch Archelaus, the son of Herod, says that he led part of the waters, passing through the borough of Neara, to irrigate the large palm groves he had planted in the plain below.*

We now stood at the foot of the Quarantana, towering steeply above us, with its indented peaks and deep, precipitous chasms. It is a picturesque mountain of richly tinged hues, like variegated marble, and rises to a height of fifteen hundred feet above the valley. A later Christian tradition has regarded it as the Mount of Temptation, where our Saviour dwelt during the forty days' fast in the wilderness.†

On the eastern and southern side of the mountain are seen a number of grottoes and caverns, where, as in the desert about the valley of the Kidron, and all along the western ridge of the Jordan valley toward the lake of Tiberias, numberless anchorites dwelt during the earlier centuries of the Byzantine empire. Cyrillos relates, among other curious legends of the time, that St. Sabas once, accompanied by his friend Agapetos, wandered from his Laura in the glen of the Kidron through the plain, in order to visit the sanctuaries on the lake of Tiberias. He ascended the western mountains, and in a solitary recess of the cliffs, far away from the dwellings of men, met with a hermit who during thirty-eight years had not seen a single human being! On his return from the lake he again visited the holy man. He found him kneeling before the altar in his cave, absorbed in deep meditation. St. Sabas tarried,

* Josephus' Antiq. 17, 3, 1.

† On account of the forty days' temptation the mountain was called Quarantana in the middle ages, from which the Arabs formed their *Jebel Kuruntul*.

that he might terminate his prayers, but time passing on and the hermit neither rising nor answering to his call, he approached and found him—a corpse. They then buried the deceased beneath a heap of stones and returned to the Laura.*

Even to the present day, the Mount Quarantana is inhabited by pilgrims, principally Abyssinians, who spend the Lent in the grottoes and live on roots and berries, which they gather in the clefts of the mountain. The caverns are still employed by the Bedouins as granaries, where they hide their wheat and barley. It happened a few years ago, that the French historian M. de Poujoulat, was attacked here on ascending the mountain, by a band of Bedouins, who suspected his Arab companions of having an intention to plunder their corn stores.

We ascended the mountain on a path partly cut in the rock, which along the terrific precipice, carried us round the steep eastern flank to the different hermitages. In a huge vaulted grotto commanding an extensive view of the plain, we found a church, where the Greek pilgrims perform the divine service during Lent. Another chapel crowns the summit of the mountain. The ascent is fatiguing and even dangerous, but our exertions were rewarded by an incomparable panorama of the whole surrounding country, brilliantly illuminated by the rich and glowing hues of a southern atmosphere. On the north of our station the mountains recede, forming a bow, but farther on they boldly advance toward the Jordan, and at a distance of eight miles cut off the view to the upper Ghor. This northern tract of the plain is likewise fertile, being sufficiently watered by two copious fountains, the Ain-Duk and another arising near a conical hill el-Aujeh, that we distinguish at some distance in the vale, the still existing ruins of which are supposed to belong to the ancient castle Phasælis, built by Herod the tyrant, to the memory of his valiant brother. Far beneath us on the east, rose the tower and huts of modern Jericho, the dwellings of wretchedness and poverty, from out the exuberant groves and corn fields, which farther on were bounded by the parched desert and the sandy outer-banks of the Jordan. The river itself is not seen, but its broad dark green belt marks its course down to the Dead Sea. Beyond, the high level line of Jebel es-Salt extends without a single soaring peak all along toward the eastern coast of the sea, as far as the eye reaches. Three vallies descend from the highland

* Cyrill. Seythopol. Vita Sabæ in Cotelarii Monum. Eccles. Græc. Vol. III, page 252.

to the plain, on the northeast of Jericho the deep and narrow Wady Shaib, farther in the interior of which, but not seen from our point of view, is situated es-Salt, the ancient Ramath in Gilead, at the present time the only inhabited city of el-Belka. Nearer and directly opposite to Jericho on the east descends Wady Seir, and farther south toward the Dead Sea, the broad, shallow Wady Hesban, on the height of which, several miles in the interior the travelers still admire the extensive ruins of Heshbon, the ancient capital of the Amorites. Here from the Mount of Temptation, I took my last view of the Dead Sea. Yonder it extended before me on the south, glittering in the beams of the morning sun like an immense golden mirror, with the mountains of the desert for its frame. In the whole picture there hardly appeared a single trace of human life or of human industry to gladden the eye. But when I take into view the grandeur of the landscape, the brilliancy of its colors, and the significant importance of its history, it presented to mine eye one of the most beautiful and memorable scenes, which will be deeply and indelibly impressed on my mind as one of my dearest recollections of the Orient.

The sun was nearly in its meridian before our large party re-assembled near the Saracenic ruins, where our horses were grazing. Early in the morning we had ordered our dragomans to strike the tents, and, escorted by some Turkish horsemen, beforehand to take the direct road over the hills to Jerusalem. The young lady in her litter had been so fatigued from the long and toilsome ride the day before, that she, to shorten her sufferings, had resolved rather to go along with the baggage train, than to accompany the rest of the party to the Mount of Temptation, and some polite British gentlemen had likewise preferred the shorter route, in order to offer her their company.

We mounted again and followed in a southern direction the aqueduct to Wady Kelt, being an eastern prolongation of the Wady es-Luveinis, which we had crossed at an earlier period, on our approach to Jerusalem from Nabulus. This valley descending on the steep south side of Mount Quarantana toward the plain, forms a large brook during the rainy season, which unites all the waters of the collateral dales, and carries them down to the Jordan. But on our passage in April the torrent had already ceased to flow, and its bed was dry. The monks in Jerusalem hold it to be the rivulet Cherith, mentioned in the Scriptures, on the banks of which the prophet Elijah, during

his flight from the persecution of King Ahab, found a refuge, and was fed by the ravens.*

On the southern bank we found various indications of the site of an ancient city. On the right of the Jerusalem road I remarked a large square building, on the very edge of the bank, erected in the Roman style of construction, so often seen in Italy and called *opus reticulatum*, and not far off an artificial mound with ancient substructions. We found several mosaic pavements, fragments of columns, and on the south of the path, beneath the western hill, a large reservoir partly excavated in the rock. The direction of the aqueduct southward through the valley to this place, the Roman style of construction of the ruins, and their extent, show that a large city once was situated on these hills, and it thus appears probable that it was the Roman Jericho, where Herodes the Tyrant built a strong fortress, a splendid royal residence, many palaces, and the hippodrome or course, where he ordered the principal men of his empire to assemble, and with death on his lips gave his sister Salome his last cruel command to cause them all to be slaughtered as soon as he had expired; an order which the prudent princess did not execute. With this view we were impressed on the spot, adopting the opinion of a distinguished writer, though our hasty survey of the ruins did not permit us to make farther inquiries. Perhaps a future traveler, who may have more leisure and a better opportunity for taking an exact sketch of the environs of Jericho, may prove the truth of our conjecture.

The direct road to Jerusalem ascends the steep western mountains south of Wady Kelt. It is an ancient deeply hollowed path, which in several turns has been beaten through the white chalky hills, and in the Scriptures is termed "the going up to Adummin, which is on the south side of the river."† From the height of this pass we had the last view of the Jordan valley, and rode on a while on the precipitous brink of Wady Kelt, opposite to the gigantic Quarantana, which, rugged and barren as it is, presented an image of fast and famine itself. Here on the bank stands a large ruinous castle already mentioned by St. Jerome as having been built during the Roman empire for the protection of the travelers, who in this dreary wilderness, the perpetual haunt of the roving Bedouins, from the time of our Lord to the present day, were exposed to depredation and murder. Acts of violence are still often perpe-

* 1 Kings 17: 3-7.

† Joshua 15: 7.

trated here in the "valley of blood," the Adummin, where the Christian tradition has placed the fine parable of the compassionate Samaritan, who finding the wounded traveler, "bound up his wounds, set him on his beast, and brought him to the inn, where he took care of him."† From the Adummin the road ran over a succession of steep and desolate heights, whence we had a distant prospect to the blue mountains in Moab, and before us, on the west, a mournful, bleak, and quite colorless desert, hills towering on hills to the stony table-land of Jeba. The road being more easy on the chalky ridge, and both riders and horses alike impatient of clearing the wilderness and arriving at Jerusalem, we set up a rapid gallop, and did not stop until we met with the vanguard of our party, taking some repose in the shade of the olive trees near a well beneath Bethany, called the fountain of the Apostles. During this passage of four hours' ride we did not see any other trace of living beings than some flocks of sheep on the distant slopes, browsing around the black tents of the shepherds. All danger of an assault being now past, we left the baggage-train behind, and hurried on to Bethany. On the eastern ascent of Mount Olivet we suddenly felt a change in the temperature, a penetrating, chilly wind blowing down from the mountain; and being lightly dressed in the Ghor, in order to ascend the Quarantana, this sudden transition from heat to cold proved highly disagreeable, and caused some of us to catch a cold, which kept us indisposed for a few days in Jerusalem.

Having on a former visit seen the tomb of Lazarus in Bethany, we now continued our course over the Mount of Olives, through the valley of Jehoshaphat, to the gate of St. Stephen, where we arrived at five o'clock in the afternoon. We then dismissed our Turkish escort and passing through the *via dolorosa*, the company dispersed at the Latin convent. Thus we accomplished our visit to the Desert, and the following day made our preparations for leaving the Holy City, perhaps forever.

† Luke 10: 30-35.

A. L. K.

Lancaster, Pa.

ART. IV.—NEVIN ON CYPRIAN.*

MY attention has been called to a series of articles, entitled Cyprian, which have appeared in the *Mercersburg Review*, over the signature of J. W. N., one of its frequent and most able contributors. The deep fund of research and the far-reaching grasp of thought and vigor of mind that characterize his articles, cannot fail to impress all unprejudiced readers, with admiration of the talents and attainments, as well as reverence for the character of the distinguished author. Although an entire stranger to his person, no one has shared more largely in those sentiments of consideration and respect than myself. I trust, therefore, I shall not be considered as indulging an unfriendly or antagonistic spirit, in offering a few strictures on the second article of the series alluded to above, which appeared in the July number of the Review.

There are many, and sometimes conflicting inferences, not always openly avowed, but which, perhaps unconsciously to himself, influence the Reviewer's mind, that do not, we think, legitimately follow from the teaching of Cyprian.

Some of these we shall endeavor to point out. Our attention, however, will be directed chiefly to the closing paragraph on pages 386 and 387.

"The Church question, (says the Reviewer,) as forced upon us by the writings of Cyprian, it is plain to see, is something a good deal deeper and more solemn than the controversy between Anglican Episcopacy and the rest of the Protestant world. We do not deny at all the importance of this controversy in its proper place; and for Episcopalianism, as a system, it is hardly necessary for us to say, we entertain no small amount of veneration and regard. We do not deny too that Cyprian, who has been called the Ignatius of the West, bears ample testimony, like his predecessor of this name in the East, to the existence of Episcopacy as an institution held to be of Apostolic origin, in the early Church. But it is most plain at the same time that we are not carried by it as a separate interest, in any way to the last ground of

* This article was written for the January number, but was received only in time for insertion in the present one.

"the system to which it originally belonged. Mere Episcopacy was not enough by any means, in the judgment of these ancient times, to uphold a true Church succession; it must be the office in unity with itself under a Catholic form; the office as representing the undivided and indivisible Apostolical commission, on which as a rock centering in Peter, the Church was to be built to the end of time. Along with this go corresponding apprehensions of the attributes and powers of the Church, which our modern Protestant Episcopacy either rejects altogether or turns into affectation and sham. The two systems are of altogether different constitution; and it is perfectly idle to think of establishing an identity between them, on the ground simply of their having in common the office of Bishops. What charm can there be in an Episcopate, that this rather than any other fragment of Peter's ship, as it originally sailed towards heaven, should be taken to carry away with it now, *as a fragment*, the power of a true Church life? No. Anglicanism is not Cyprianic Christianity. The question of Episcopacy is in truth of only secondary and very subordinate account. The grand issue always, is that which lies between Protestantism and Romanism. This we are bound to look solemnly in the face."

J. W. N. is not aware, perhaps, that this conclusion of his well labored article, contains within it, what to any tolerably informed Anglican churchman, appears to be a most palpable and glaring "*petitio puncti*;" a mere assumption of the whole question between him and sectarian Christianity, based upon a loose and careless estimate, if not total misapprehension of the distinctive principles of the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in America. Has the Reviewer of Cyprian yet to learn, that no well informed Anglican churchman, ever pretends, that "*mere Episcopacy*," is "enough to uphold a true Church succession?" or that he would ever think of maintaining an identity between modern Anglicanism and primitive Christianity, "on the ground simply of their having in common the office of Bishops?" O! no! that is not the ground on which Anglicanism rests its claims to the reality of a true Church growth, and "the power of a true Church life." Episcopacy indeed as a salient angle in our Ecclesiastical fortress, jutting out and strongly buttressed by all tradition and all historic record, has been singled out both by friend and foe, as a point of attack and defence, which to common observation, presents the most marked distinction between the

Church and the sect system which surrounds it. Thus isolated and pushed forward in every popular controversy with sectarianism, it is not at all surprising that even the most clear and discriminating minds should sometimes fall into the error of supposing, that all the claims of the Anglican Church, as opposed to the rest of the Protestant world, were narrowed down into the single question of the Apostolical succession of her Episcopacy. That this supposition is very wide of the truth, will, we trust, sufficiently appear, from the facts which must necessarily come into view, in our examination of the article before us. Even J. W. N. has fallen into this common mistake; as too plainly appears from his closing assertions: "No. Anglicanism is not Cyprianic Christianity. The question of Episcopacy, is in truth of only secondary and very subordinate account. The grand issue always, is that which lies between Protestantism and Romanism." Perhaps unconsciously to himself, the Reviewer, here makes Episcopacy equivalent to Anglicanism; as grave a mistake, as to make Puritanism the sum and substance of Protestantism.

There seems also a latent persuasion in the mind of the Reviewer, that Cyprianic Christianity, must have been the same as the Catholic Christianity of his day. But this is as far from the truth, as it would be to assume, that the mind and writings of any single Bishop in either the Anglican or Roman communions, may be safely taken as a full and reliable exponent of their respective views of Catholic Christianity. This will more fully appear as we proceed to consider what the Reviewer calls "the grand issue between Protestantism and Romanism." As we are not informed what we are to understand by the term Protestantism, in this connection, we cannot compare its claims with those of Romanism to an identity with "Cyprianic Christianity." Anglicanism, on the contrary, is a well defined and well known form of modern Christianity, which can, therefore, be readily contrasted with modern Romanism and the doctrines of Cyprian. Although assertion, unsupported by testimony, is of little value in this *all-things-proving age*, yet in order that we may start from the same common ground with the Reviewer, we will for once follow his example, and by way of offset to his assumption that "Anglicanism is not Cyprianic Christianity," we will as broadly assert that modern *Romanism is not Cyprianic Christianity*.

And now with mere assertion in equilibrio, let us compare the two modern systems with that of Cyprian. Is either sys-

tem identical with Cyprianism? If not, which most nearly approximates it? And further, if irreconcilable variations from Cyprianism should be discovered, are they in accordance or at variance with the authorized and avowed doctrines of the Catholic Church of that early age? These are the questions which the Reviewer has fairly forced upon us, and which justice to ourselves and fidelity to the cause of Christianity, require that we should as fairly meet.

The doctrine of the identity and unity of the Church lies at the foundation of Cyprian's theory. This is clearly and forcibly shown by the Reviewer, (on pages 348, 349 and 350) where, according to Cyprian's teaching, "there is from Christ one Church divided throughout the world into many members, likewise one Episcopate, spread abroad by a concordant multitude of many Bishops"—again on page 352, this unity includes also the *oneness* of the whole Episcopal order: "the Episcopate is one, the parts of which hold severally from the whole. The Church also is one, which is extended into multitude by the force of its own fecundity; just as there are many rays of the sun, but only one light, &c.," and page 353: "so the Church of the Lord also irradiated with light, sends out her rays over all the earth, still there is but one light, which is everywhere diffused and the unity of the body is not divided." * * * "one head, one origin, one mother of continually prolific grace."

The Reviewer also shows, that Cyprian rests the entire structure of the Church on the Apostolic commission and makes the unity of the Church consist in the unity of the whole Episcopate with itself, and of the members of the Church with the Episcopate. This unity is consistent also with a perfect equality in the Episcopal office, "the other apostles were also indeed what Peter was, endowed with like partnership both of honor and power," and yet Cyprian further maintains a *Primacy* vested in the Roman See, without any apparent consciousness of its conflicting in any way, with the doctrine of a perfect equality and concordant unity, in the entire Episcopate of the Catholic Church. The Reviewer further shows that according to Cyprian, "this unity (of the Church) the Bishops especially are bound firmly to assert and maintain, so as to show clearly that the Episcopate itself also is one and indivisible."

This doctrine of the entireness, or indivisible unity of the Church, is held as firmly now, both at Rome and Canterbury,

as it was at Carthage in the days of Cyprian. But when we seek for the peculiar and characteristic marks of this unity, we find that Cyprian and *modern Anglicanism* unite in making them consist in a consentient Episcopate, in harmony and unity with itself; and each Bishop the centre and bond of union with all the other members of the Church, within his own diocese. Modern Rome, on the other hand, maintains that the Papal Supremacy is the great bond and centre of unity in the Church; that "the Bishops of Rome, according to God's institution and by original right derived therefrom, should have an universal supremacy and jurisdiction over the whole of Christ's Church." They claim the right to nominate, and appoint, to order and confirm the consecration of all Bishops; and even the right to annul and vacate the office after consecration, as may best suit their own sovereign will and pleasure. It would be an exceedingly difficult matter to read such doctrines and powers as these into Cyprian's teaching respecting the *Primacy of the Roman Patriarch*, as will more fully appear when we come to discuss its character.

But on the single point of Church unity, as grounded upon the Saviour's commission to the Apostles to teach and baptize, and on the inherent equality and unity of all the members of the Episcopate throughout the world, each being the common centre of unity in his own Diocese, we find a very near and marked resemblance between the doctrines of Cyprian and modern Anglicanism, but not the remotest likeness to those of modern Rome.

A still more striking resemblance, amounting almost to a positive identity, will be found in the teaching of Cyprian and the modern Anglican Church, respecting the origin, inherent powers and jurisdiction of Bishops.

Does Cyprian teach, that Bishops hold their office by Divine right as constituted by Christ? that, *the only true order of the constitution of the Church*, "and so of the derivation of its functions and powers was; Christ first, the head of the universal organism, then the Apostolate continued by regular succession in the Episcopate; then the ministry in its lower orders, and finally the body of the people held in connection with the head through the medium of this hierarchy, which is thus Divinely ordained to be the one only channel of all descending communications of life and grace?" (page 361.) The Anglican Church maintains substantially the same doctrine, as may be learned from nearly all her writers on Ecclesiastical

Polity, and especially from the judicious Hooker, (Bk. V:) who is received as authority by all parties in the Church.

But will modern Romanism subscribe to this Cyprianic theory of the Church which makes Christ, and not the Pope, as his vicegerent, the universal headship of the Episcopate? And which, moreover, looks to each Bishop as the centre of unity for both clergy and laity in his own Diocese? Here again Anglicanism, both in letter and spirit is almost a fac simile of Cyprianism, whilst Cyprian and modern Rome are as wide as the poles asunder.

Does Cyprian maintain, that the Episcopal office derived through an unbroken line of successive ordinations from the Apostles is essential to the integrity and perfect organization of the Church? So does the Anglican Church assert, that "from the Apostle's time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons, &c."

. . . . And . . . "to the intent that these orders may be continued and reverently used and esteemed in this Church, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon, in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined and admitted thereunto according to the form hereafter following, or hath had Episcopal consecration or ordination." (Pref. to Ord. Serv.) The 23rd article forbids any one to minister to any congregation, "before he be lawfully called and sent" "by those who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." The first canon of the Church in these United States, ordains that "In this Church there shall always be three orders in the ministry, Bishops, Priests and Deacons:" and canon 36: that "no person shall be permitted to officiate in any congregation of this Church, without first producing the evidences of his being a minister thereof, &c." The statute law of England decrees that "no man can be a lawful Priest or Deacon, unless he be ordained by a Bishop." (Stat. 13, Eliz. and Act of uniformity 14: Car. II.)

Does Cyprian (page 350) distinguish between the office of a Bishop, the powers imparted in ordination and consecration, and the right of exercising "true jurisdiction and lawful power?" This is a distinction perfectly familiar to the Anglican Church both in the Old and New world. At this moment there are Bishops in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, without jurisdiction. The Episcopal Office is received

from the hands of at least three Bishops and with the concurrence of a majority of the whole Episcopal order: but jurisdiction is given by the whole Church, expressed in General Convention, or in case of the recess of that body by the expressed consent of a majority of the Bishops of the Church, and also of the Dioceses, through their standing committees; the call or nomination both to office and jurisdiction, always originating with the Diocese over which the Bishop is to preside. Should jurisdiction be relinquished or abandoned; still the inherent powers of the office will remain, until for sufficient reason they be taken away by degradation from the ministry, which must always be the concurrent act, or with the sanction of a majority of the whole Episcopal order. It follows, therefore, that in the *Anglican Church*, as organized in these States, "only in the unity of the office universally taken, can any single Bishop have *true jurisdiction or lawful power*." (Page 350.) He must be in communion with the whole Episcopate.

Here again we find the Anglican Church in harmony with Cyprian; for he clearly shows that whilst consecration to the Episcopate was received from the Bishops, jurisdiction was given by the Church, in her corporate capacity; nomination or election being first made by the vacant Diocese. The Reviewer indeed has shown us that Cyprian himself, had jurisdiction almost forced upon him by the popular will. But can modern Rome claim here any affinity with Cyprian? Would she permit jurisdiction or consecration to be given in this way? On the contrary, has not the Papacy notoriously spoiled both Bishops and Dioceses of all those powers which they fully exercised in the days of Cyprian?

Again, we shall find that the Primacy of St. Peter as acknowledged by Cyprian, differs widely from the doctrine of Papal *Supremacy* maintained by modern Rome.

Take the strongest language of Cyprian, as quoted by the Reviewer on page 352, admitting even the clauses in brackets, although we think there is a great preponderance of critical authority against their genuineness, and to what does it amount? "The other Apostles were also indeed what Peter was endowed with like partnership both of honor and power, but the beginning proceeds from unity, (and the primacy is given to Peter, that there might be shown to be one Church of Christ and one Cathedra. They are all pastors, and there is shown to be one flock, which is fed by all the Apostles with unanimous consent,) that the Church of Christ may be demonstrated one."

..... "Will he, who withstands and resists the Church, (who deserts the Cathedra of Peter on which the Church is founded,) presume still that he is in the Church, &c., &c." . . . In the first place, we have here explicitly asserted, the doctrine of equality in the Episcopal Order; "partnership both of honor and power:" *all are pastors over one flock which is fed by all with unanimous consent.* The same doctrine is maintained (on page 366) in Cyprian's letter to Stephen, Bishop of Rome: "For although we are many Pastors "we feed nevertheless one flock and are bound to look after all the sheep which Christ hath purchased by his blood, . . . &c." Here is the fullest assertion of equality, a joint and equal participation of all the powers and honors of the Apostolic office: but as the Reviewer has noticed there is nothing here nor elsewhere in Cyprian, which savors at all of "a strict independency in the jurisdiction of Bishops." The Reviewer was obviously led to notice this distinction between the equality and independency of Bishops from an erroneous opinion, which he has imbibed, that the Anglican Church asserts the absolute independency of the Episcopal office. This is plain we think, from his assertion, that Cyprian "is often appealed to by modern Episcopalians, accordingly, as a powerful witness for what is sometimes called the independency of the common Episcopal office over against the pretensions of the See of Rome." . . . And again in the note on page 367. "Our American Episcopacy is Congregational."

This is a grave mistake of the Reviewer; and one which evidently in his view, distorts and deforms the whole theory of the Anglican Church. And well it may; for such doctrine practically carried out would indeed be, as he justly characterizes it, a "suicidal anomaly." But we can assure the Reviewer that he is under an entire misapprehension in this matter; such an anomaly does not exist. The evidence that it does not, is full, clear and widely spread throughout our entire country, in the unhappy cases of discipline which have occurred in the American branch of the Church. Would New York with nearly a fourth part of all the clergy, and perhaps one half of all the wealth of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these States, have submitted to the humiliation, and as she claimed, the injustice and indignity heaped upon her, could she have planted herself on the unassailable ground of *absolute independency*? From such an impregnable position, New Jersey might but yesterday, have expelled the *whole bench* of

Bishops from her borders, and sent them home to their own Dioceses. But no; it is because the Church receives both in its spirit and its letter, the Cyprianic doctrine of equality in unity, a concordant oneness of the whole body, in which *all the parts are equal in honor and power*, but each subordinate and obedient to the legitimate voice of the whole, when legitimately expressed, that every Bishop and every Diocese bows submissively to the canonical and judicial decisions of the Church. Her voice is law. She knows nothing of absolute independency on the part of either Clergy or Laity, nor yet in her corporate Diocesan capacity; nothing of the Congregational, "suicidal" principle of nullification; and nothing of the newly coined doctrine of sectarian theology, that schism may without sin be used as a safety valve, to let off the discordant and explosive influences that may from time to time be generated within the bosom of the Church.

So entirely accordant on this point are the doctrines of Cyprian with the Anglican Church, that his very language might readily be taken for that of one of her standard writers. With Cyprian, the Episcopal Church magnifies the office of a Bishop, "as one directly representing among men the supreme authority of Christ," and we may safely assert, that with her, as well as for him, "in this respect all Bishops are of like dignity and co-ordinate power."

The Reviewer concedes, "that all this it must be allowed is not answerable exactly to the order of the Papal system as we find it established in later times." Answerable exactly? is it *at all* answerable to the modern Papal system? Dare a modern Bishop of the Roman communion write to the Pope, as Cyprian did "to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, in the tone of a colleague, possessing the same rank with himself?" No indeed. "The supremacy of the Pope was not in Cyprian's mind, or at least is not in his writings, as it rules, for instance, in our day the thinking of Wiseman or Hughes." (Page 366.) No, no; with them, the Pope is not merely *primus inter pares*, "a colleague of like dignity and co-ordinate power," with all other Bishops of the Church Catholic; but he is the sole vicar of Christ, the Bishop over all Bishops, the supreme and absolutely independent head of the Church militant and God's vicegerent upon earth.

But although "the supremacy of the Pope was not in Cyprian's mind," the *Primacy* of the Roman See was most clearly recognized by him. That his *Primacy* was not supremacy, is

sufficiently evident from his views of Episcopal equality. His *Primacy* was not autocratic. It claimed not absolute power and authority over the other Bishops of the Church. With him the inherent dignity and power of the Episcopal office was the same at Carthage as at Rame. Yet, Cyprian's Primacy was evidently a mark of distinction and rank, that was well understood by the Church at large. The very manner in which he alludes and appeals to it, proves this. He speaks of it as affording an easy test, whereby all schismatics and heretics might be tried. Non communion with this common centre of unity, was, in his view, an open and palpable act of self condemnation, whereby all separatists of whatever name or grade, cut themselves off from the Catholic Church. This, with him, was a convenient captandum argument, easily apprehended by the vulgar mind, and Cyprian evidently makes the most of it; even stretching it beyond the ruled decisions of the Church in Council; for she would never deliberately sanction the hasty judgment of those, who, in the heat of controversy, might mercilessly cast out of the Church all who fell into heresy or schism. In her judgment they were still members of Christ's fold, who, though erring and wandering, might yet be reclaimed and restored, and over whose recovery there would be more rejoicing than over *ninety and nine that went not astray*.

We must, therefore, take his language with some grains of allowance and caution, when used in the hot blood of earnest disputation. We can readily perceive, that he would, under such circumstances, unconsciously magnify and even exaggerate the powers and honors of the Primacy, in order to render the argument more forcible and convincing. He does not, therefore, cautiously guard his language; for he is in no fear of its being misunderstood when taken in connection with his oft asserted doctrine of parity in the Episcopal office. In what then did that Primacy consist, if it was not answerable to the modern doctrine of Papal supremacy?

Although Cyprian does not define or describe it, the Church in her canonical Scriptures and in the acts and canons of her Synods, sufficiently indicates *what it was* and *what it was not*.

The Scriptures show that it was not a grant of power and authority to St. Peter, over the other apostles, to be transmitted perpetually to his successors in the Roman See. We have already seen that the commission was the same to all the Apostles. As the Father sent Christ, so He sent the eleven. All had like power to teach and baptize, to open and shut the king-

dom of heaven. The keys were given to all; all alike were to use them. The only distinction granted to St. Peter, was the privilege of first opening the kingdom of heaven to all believers; to the Jews, home-born and strangers, on the day of Pentecost, and afterwards to the Gentiles, in the person of Cornelius and his household. Here indeed was a personal distinction, but not a distinction that could be transmitted to his successors. This foundation of the Church could be laid but once by Peter and not afterwards again by his successors. In this sense, we behold in him personally, the Rock on which the Church was built, because he first preached the Gospel to Jew and Gentile. But even in this he shared the honor with others; for on the day of Pentecost the eleven stood up with him. All was done with unanimous consent, and probably all preached to different parts of the assembled multitude.

That Peter exercised no peculiar power or authority in thus laying the foundations of the Church, is manifest from St. Paul's teaching, that believers "are built upon *the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets*, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." (Eph. 2: 20.) This doctrine is also confirmed by St. John (Rev. 20: 14,) in vision, in which the wall of the heavenly city "had *twelve foundations*, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb."

Hence it appears that St. Paul and St. John, speaking by the Holy Ghost, rest the foundations, not on Peter exclusively, but on the twelve Apostles.

That St. Peter had no supremacy over the other Apostles, involving a superiority of power or jurisdiction, will further appear from St. Paul, (1 Cor. 12: 27,) "now ye are the body of Christ and members in particular. And God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, &c." Here it is evident, that St. Paul knew nothing of the supreme earthly headship of St. Peter; for with such knowledge, he could hardly say that God had set the Apostles first in the Church; but first Peter and then Apostles. And furthermore, it is marvellous indeed, that there should not be a single hint or intimation of any kind in the Apostolic writings, not even in Peter's Epistles, of the existence or exercise of the extraordinary power, which is now claimed for him.

Christ himself, has, on several occasions, declared against any primacy of power or authority.

When the Holy Supper was instituted, "there was also a strife among them which should be accounted the greatest."

(Luke 22: 24.) Our Lord did not quiet the dissension by assuring them that Peter should have the supremacy or primacy of honor and power, but said expressly, that they should not exercise lordship one over another: "the kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them," "but ye shall not be so;" "he that is greater (or older) among you, let him be as the younger, &c." Peter was the oldest of all the Apostles; there can, therefore, be but little doubt that it was he and James and John, the two sons of Zebedee, who chiefly contended for precedence, and hence the solemn and affectionate caution of our Lord: "Simon! Simon! behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat, &c." Our Lord had before this, rejected the suit of James and John, through their mother, showing that the only superiority among them would consist in their humble and faithful service. (Math. 20: 27. Mark 10: 37.)

On yet another occasion, they contended who should be the greatest, and our Lord then also refused to give any one authority over the rest, saying, "If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all and servant of all." (Math. 18: 1, Mark 9: 34, and Luke 9: 46.) Now in all these instances, how easy to settle all further dispute, by simply saying, *Let Peter be chiefest amongst you, and let his Episcopate always have the pre-eminence, both in honor and power.* But the Saviour said no such thing. On the contrary He expressly declares, that there shall be no such primacy; and much less did he countenance the kind of supremacy claimed by modern Rome.

In view of these positive declarations of Christ against any kind of supremacy or lordship in the Apostolic college, and in the absence of all recognition in the Apostolic writings of any primacy among the Apostles, save that which St. Paul attained, a primacy of labors and sufferings for the cause of Christ, we may safely aver that no such supremacy as is now claimed, was instituted by the Saviour or his Apostles, and therefore, that the primacy acknowledged by Cyprian was not *jure Divino*, but a primacy of order and precedence, at first tacitly yielded by the Church to the Bishop of the great metropolis of the Roman Empire, and afterwards confirmed by Synodical action. The subsequent growth of power and authority in the Roman See, can be distinctly traced from this small beginning, which had its origin in the weight of influence, which, the number of its clergy and people, its wealth and charity,

its steadfastness in the faith, the dignity of the city and the reputation of its founders, St. Paul and St. Peter, easily and naturally acquired for it. A condensed view of this subject may be found in "Palmer on the Church," sustained by primitive as well as Protestant and Roman ecclesiastical authorities. It would lead us too far away from our principal subject, to present it in extenso here.

We proceed to show, that what was at first tacitly yielded as a matter of deference to numbers, wealth and influence, was afterwards confirmed by Synodical action.

The Council of Nice, of 318 Bishops, called by the Emperor Constantine, A. D. 325, confirms the ancient usages respecting the Patriarchal authority of the most noted metropolitan Sees. Canon VI. enjoins, "Let the ancient customs be maintained which are in Egypt and Lybia and Pentapolis, according to which the Bishop of Alexandria has authority over all those places. For this is also customary to the Bishop of Rome. In like manner in Antioch and in the other Provinces, the privileges are to be preserved to the Churches."

This canon appears to have been made with particular reference to discussions in the Church in Alexandria, and against Meletius, who had invaded the privileges of the Bishop of that See. It confirms also the privileges of all metropolitans; but grants no more authority to Rome than to any other Patriarchal Church.

The VII canon of Nice, was also enacted to settle a question of rank or precedence. "Since a custom and ancient tradition has prevailed, that the Bishop of *Ælia* should be honored, let him have the second place of honor saving to the metropolis the authority which is due to it." This canon shows the usage of the Church at and before the year A. D., 325. *Ælia* had been honored by ancient custom, because it was on the site of the ancient Jerusalem which had been destroyed by Titus; but *Ælius* Hadrianus, had rebuilt the city, calling it by his own name; yet the Council decreed that the general usage should prevail even in this case, whereby the first rank was assigned to *Cæsarea*, then the metropolis of the Roman Province embracing *Judea*. These canons show the usage of the Church, which was to assign rank and precedence to Bishops in accordance with the rank or importance of the chief cities or provinces that constituted their Sees.

The second oecumenical council of one hundred and fifty Oriental Bishops, called by the Emperor Theodosius the elder,

also enacted two canons on this subject, the II and III. The second canon was passed in consequence of some irregular proceedings on the part of the Bishop of Alexandria, who, after Gregory Nazianzum had been ordained Bishop of Constantinople, sent some Bishops from Egypt to ordain another, Maximus the Cynic, over the same See. The canon accordingly decrees, *first*, "that Bishops must not go beyond their own Dioceses;" *second*, "that the Bishop of Alexandria must have sole administration of the affairs of Egypt;" *third*, that the Bishops of the East must administer in the East only;" *fourth*, "that the privileges which were assigned to the Church at Antioch, by the canons made at Nice, be preserved;" *fifth*, "that the Bishops of the Asian Diocese must administer the affairs of the Asian only;" *sixth*, "and those of the Pontic Diocese, those of the Pontic only;" *seventh*, "and those of Thrace, the affairs of Thrace only;" *eighth*, Bishops may not, without being called; "go beyond the bounds of their diocese for the purpose of ordaining, or any other ecclesiastical function."

This canon shows, that in the judgment of the Council, the usage of the Church in assigning precedence or rank, according to the importance of the See, gave no authority to exercise jurisdiction over other dioceses.

The conduct of the Bishop of Alexandria, must, therefore, have excited the general indignation of the Church, which this Council seems intentionally to have visited upon him by enacting the III canon, as follows: "The Bishop of Constantinople shall have the primacy of *honor* after the Bishop of Rome, because that Constantinople is new Rome."

Here we find, that the precedence of *honor*, next after Rome, was taken from Alexandria, which had previously enjoyed it and given to Constantinople, because that had now become new Rome, the Imperial city. This shows very clearly also, the nature of the primacy enjoyed by old Rome; a primacy of rank or honor, and not of jurisdiction and power.

The third general Council of two hundred Bishops, held at Ephesus, A. D., 431, passed no new canons on the subject of order or primacy in the Church, but shows by its first canon that the assembled Council of the Church had undoubted power and authority over all Bishops and metropolitans of the provinces. The Synods of the Church and not the Bishop of Rome, had in that age jurisdiction over all the Bishops of the Church.

The Council of Chalcedon composed of three hundred and thirty Bishops, was called by the Emperor Maveian, A. D. 451,

on account of the Eutychian heresy. This was the fourth general Council : it passed thirty canons, which throw much light on the usages of the Church at that time. The first canon confirmed the canons of former Synods, and consequently endorses their views of the *primacy* of Rome and other Patriarchal cities. The twelfth canon shows, that whenever any city by *Royal letters*, "has been honored with the name of Metropolis, the Bishop who has charge of the Church of such a city, shall enjoy the honorary title only," when there is another city in the same province, which had previously enjoyed the title and privileges of metropolitan. This recognizes as a settled principle, that rank and precedence among the Bishops in the Church was determined by the rank and honor conferred by the Empire on its cities and provinces. The ecclesiastical followed, in this respect, the civil regulations of the Empire as may be learned from the seventeenth canon of this Council, which orders, that if any city has been newly erected by Royal authority, or shall hereafter be erected, let the order of the ecclesiastical parishes follow the political and public forms." This shows that the rules of ecclesiastical precedence were as well understood and as much insisted on, as laws of precedence in the State. And it shows also, that the principle on which the rules of precedence were based, was the same both in Church and State, viz: the dignity of the city or Province represented. Now with this clue to guide us, it is easy to understand why the whole Church should concede to the Bishop of Rome a primacy of rank over all other Bishops. He represented the Imperial city, and ranked accordingly. This is a fair inference from the canons already quoted, and ought of itself to be conclusive.

But we are not left to deduce this fact by inference from general usage: the Fathers of Chalcedon, as if to provide against the monstrous pretensions of later times, have left on record the reason why Rome enjoyed any primacy at all. The twenty-eighth canon declares, that "*the Fathers properly gave the Primacy to the throne of the elder Rome, because that was the Imperial city.*" Nothing can be plainer. The Council asserts that the *Fathers* gave the Primacy to the throne of old Rome, and that on account of the dignity of the city. There is no intimation of any Primacy, much less supremacy being derived from St. Peter, by special appointment of Christ: and yet it could hardly have been omitted by this and the preceding Councils, if any Primacy had been acknowledged by the

Church as *jure Divino*. Nay, more, if such claims in behalf of Rome, had, at that early day, been seriously put forth, this very Council at Chalcedon, must either have affirmed or denied them. But the Fathers then assembled, only affirmed a Primacy of rank founded on the Imperial dignity of the city. The whole drift of the canon, which was warmly opposed by the Roman influence, was to elevate the See of Constantinople to Patriarchal dignity, and give it a certain defined authority and jurisdiction over several other metropolitan Provinces. This Rome objected to, not because jurisdiction belonged, *jure Divino*, to the See of St. Peter, but because it sanctioned a most unjust usurpation, on the part of the Bishop of Constantinople, of the long acknowledged rights and privileges of the metropolitan Sees of Antioch and Alexandria, which ranked next to Rome; and also because it encroached upon the rights of many other Bishops. Surely in such a contest Rome would have asserted her highest prerogative, and the Council, in self-defence, must have affirmed or denied her claims. Hence, it seems perfectly evident, that no such claims were ever made. The dispute at this Council ran so high, that an appeal was made by the Romans to the Imperial judges, who, after due investigation, gave their decision, "that the *primacy and chief honor* should by all means be preserved according to the canons, to the Archbishop of old Rome, and that the Archbishop of the Imperial city of Constantinople, new Rome, should enjoy the same privilege of honor." The decision goes on to confirm also to the Bishop of Constantinople the Patriarchal powers set forth in the canons.

Thus, the several Councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon, express the same common sentiment of the Church respecting the Roman Primacy, bringing us down through a period of full two-hundred years after Cyprian, and nowhere do we find more conceded to Rome, than a Primacy of rank and order, and never a Supremacy *jure Divino*, of jurisdiction and power.

If such were the Primacy acknowledged by the Church in the days of Cyprian, we must suppose that such was his doctrine also; for he does not appear conscious of setting forth any novelty. Such a Primacy, moreover, renders Cyprian consistent with himself, and it is the only view that will harmonize, with his loudly asserted doctrine of parity in the Episcopate, and with his own "high sense of the prerogatives and rights of each Bishop in his own See."

Hence, when writing to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, he may well assume the tone of a colleague, of equal rank, and of equal inherent power, derived from the common commission of Christ; and even go so far as to dispute with him, respecting the Baptism of heretics, and "take ground openly against him, as Paul withstood Peter face to face, charging him with error and overbearing presumption." (Page 366.)

Here we may pause and ask, what resemblance to the Primacy, acknowledged by Cyprian, can be found, in the modern Roman doctrine of Papal supremacy? Nicer optics than ours, will be required, to discover the remotest likeness.

The Anglican Church, on the other hand, it will be found, always acknowledged, with the Church of the second and third centuries, a Primacy of *rank and honor* in the Roman See, but not a supremacy of *jurisdiction and power*. None of the legitimate rights of the Bishop of Rome, as settled by the canons of the early Church, were ever disputed by the Anglican Church, but his usurped jurisdiction, and his blasphemous assumption of titles and powers which belong to God alone, she did disown and reject, at the Reformation.

Thus we have shown the close resemblance of Anglicanism, on many prominent points, to the doctrines of Cyprian. Let us briefly recapitulate. We have seen:

I. That the unity of the Church, as grounded on the Saviour's commission, involves and embraces within itself, as one of the leading and indispensable elements, the divine institution of Episcopacy.

II. That the unity of the Church implies also the unity of the whole Episcopate with itself and the paramount authority of each Bishop in his own diocese, as the common centre and bond of union for both clergy and laity.

III. That the inherent powers of the office, being derived by uninterrupted succession, from the divine commission, through Episcopal ordination, are separate and distinct from jurisdiction, which is assigned by the Church in her corporate capacity.

IV. That the Anglican Church agrees with Cyprian in maintaining a concordant unity of the whole Episcopate, in which all the parts are equal in honor and power, but each subordinate and obedient to the legitimate voice of the whole; and that she has never maintained nor countenanced the doctrine of absolute independency.

V. That the Saviour did not grant to St. Peter a Primacy

or supremacy of honor, power and jurisdiction, to be transmitted through all time, to the incumbents of his Episcopal See; but expressly declared that there should be no such Primacy.

VI. And lastly, from the canons and Synodical action of the early Church, that the Primacy conceded to Rome was one of honor and rank only, and not of jurisdiction and power; and that such was the Primacy acknowledged by Cyprian.

In all these points we find Anglicanism in harmony with the teaching of Cyprian; and we may add, with the Catholic Christianity, also, of the first four centuries. We might extend the parallel still further, and show that Cyprian's doctrine of the *Sacraments* is substantially the same as that set forth in the formularies, Articles, and standard writers of the Anglican Church. All is based upon the principle, that there is in a sacrament, with the outward or visible sign or form, an inward, spiritual grace. It is not merely a token or sign, but a means for the transmission of grace to the recipient, and a pledge to assure him thereof. All this may be foreign to the general spirit of sectarian theology in our day, but it is perfectly familiar to the Anglican churchman. For him there is one Lord, one faith, one Baptism for the remission of sins, one divinely instituted and organized Church. For him that Church is "the organ and medium of grace," not merely by proclaiming salvation, but, as the divinely appointed organism for the transmission of grace to mankind, in the use of all the appointed means, each for its peculiar end; as prayer, reading and hearing the word, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. These, he believes, are the ordinary means of grace, appointed of God to be used in and by the Church, which, in this way, becomes the instrumental channel of salvation. In a word, he believes that both divine grace and final salvation are assured to the faithful in the Church, whilst there is no promise, or appointed way, of salvation outside of the Church. The promises are to those within, and not to those who remain without. These are views common to Cyprian and the modern Anglican. But modern Rome endeavors to impose upon the Church doctrines which Cyprian never heard of, and which the Anglican wholly rejects. Cyprian knew nothing of the doctrine, that "in the mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead. And that in the Holy Eucharist is truly, really, and *substantially* the body and blood, with the soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the *whole substance* of the bread into his body

and of the *whole substance* of the wine into his blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation."

. . . That "under *one kind only*, all and whole Christ, and the true sacrament is received." . . . That "*there is a purgatory*, and the souls detained there are holpen by the suffrages of the faithful." . . . That "the saints reigning with Christ are to be worshipped and prayed unto." . . . That "their relics are to be worshipped." . . . That "the Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church is the *mother and mistress* of all Churches." (See creed of Pope Pius IV, first published by authority, A. D., 1564.)

These, with the practical abuses of *image* worship, with set formulas for prayer and praise to the Virgin Mary, are monstrous innovations upon the Catholic faith and worship of the days of Cyprian.

But we need not extend our comparison. Enough has been shown to satisfy any unprejudiced mind, that Cyprian, could he return to earth, would find in the Anglican system, a near approach to the doctrines of Carthage; whilst at Rome, he would be branded as a heretic and an apostate from the faith.

Our strictures have already so far exceeded the limits which we originally assigned them, that we must notice but few of the erroneous inferences of the Reviewer.

Those on page 367, respecting the *primacy* of Rome as a real centre of unity for the *universal Episcopal College*, must be limited by the attributes of that *primacy*. The one acknowledged by Cyprian would render Rome the centre of unity only so far as rank and precedence are concerned, but not a centre by right of jurisdiction and supreme authority in matters of faith and practice.

The Arch-Episcopal See of Canterbury bears much the same relation to the Anglican Church throughout the British Empire, that the See of Rome did in the age of Cyprian to the Church in the Roman Empire. The city, with the suburban Provinces of Italy and the adjacent Islands, limited the *jurisdiction* of the one, as the Province of Canterbury does the other; but their influence alike pervaded and pervades the limits of their respective Empires.

The *assertion* on the same page, that, "as the Church at large must be held together by a real bond in the Episcopate, so this again must be bound like an orb or sphere to some single centre that shall be the principle or beginning of its unity in a like actual view;" is a mere assumption of the Reviewer,

which can neither be justly chargeable to Cyprian, nor to the authorized teaching of the Church in his day.

On page 369, also, we must object, that Cyprian does not deserve the imputation, that "he may have led the way in asserting the full sense of the Church system at some points," &c., &c. Cyprian, in our view, was no teacher of novelties. He was, indeed, what, at the present day, would be termed a "high churchman;" and often in the heat of controversy, pushed an argument to conclusions which the doctrines and practice of the Church would not warrant. We have an instance of this in the controversy respecting Baptism by those in a state of schism and heresy, in which he was entirely overruled by the Synodical decisions of the Church. But Cyprian certainly did not lead the way, in asserting what the Reviewer seems to consider "the full sense of the Church system," in the High-Roman doctrine of Papal supremacy. His Primacy was not Autocracy. "The full sense of the Church system" had already been asserted long before the time of Cyprian. The full growth of the Church, indeed, is not yet completed; but like the oak first bursting from its acorn shell, the Church, in the hands of the Apostles, developed all the characteristics of its system; its fullest sense was then brought out to human view as a divine organization and appointment for the salvation of mankind. It was perfect in its kind; it needed nothing but growth and increase: no other *development* is consistent with its origin and object, as a divine creation and not a mere human institution.

So again on the same page: "All goes to show that Stephen was known to claim such central relation to the universal Episcopal college, by right of *succession from Peter*, and that this right was sustained by the general consent and tradition of the Church." Now, we have sufficiently shown, not by overstrained inferences, drawn from what we must be excused for calling *loose and careless generalizations*, but from reliable historic records, that Stephen *did not claim*, and that the Church *did not concede*, even a primacy of order and rank, on the ground, or "by right of succession from Peter;" but simply on the ground that Rome was the imperial city. The inference of the Reviewer, therefore, falls at once like every other baseless fabric.

Similar inferences will also be found on page 370, based on the same mistaken views of the Primacy, which, therefore, will not require further notice here.

We trust that the Reviewer, on a fuller consideration of the entire subject, will discover that the teaching of Cyprian bears no resemblance to that of modern Rome; and that although "Anglicanism is not Cyprianic Christianity," it bears to it so strong a resemblance, that the "grand issue which always lies between Protestantism and Romanism," may safely be, in time to come, as it has been mainly in times past, entrusted to the care and guardianship of the Anglican Church.

We trust, also, that it will be seen and felt, that "the Church question, forced upon us by the writings of Cyprian," is neither *deeper*, nor *more solemn*, is in reality nothing more nor less, than "the controversy between Anglican Episcopacy and the rest of the Protestant world."

We trust, too, that it will be sufficiently evident from what has been advanced, that *Anglicanism* is something more than "mere Episcopacy;" and that it includes in its system higher apprehensions of the attributes and powers of the Church, which, in practice, it does not "reject altogether, or turn into affectation and sham." And, moreover, it has been sufficiently shown, we fondly trust, that there are no good grounds for the assertion, that "the two systems are of *altogether* different constitution;" and, also, that it is an entire misapprehension of the whole subject to suppose, that "the having in common the office of Bishops," is the only ground on which to establish an identity between them. Nor have we learned, as yet, either from the teaching of antiquity, or the light which the Reviewer has shed upon the writings of Cyprian, to call the *spouse of Christ and Church of the living God*, "Peter's Ship." Neither can we accustom ourselves to look upon the Church as broken into fragments and scattered to the winds. This is no part of the Anglican's theory. With him, the Church is one; the Episcopate is inherent in the Church and consequently, there is for him, no perfect Church organization without a Bishop.

The Anglican Church claims mission *jure Divino*. Her's is ordinary mission, received by right of succession, from the Apostles, and she asks all who have not this *ordinary* mission, to show, as did Moses and Christ, by miraculous powers, that they have extraordinary mission, before she can acknowledge their authority to baptize and admit into Christ's fold; for she inquires with St. Paul, "How can they preach except they be sent?" sent by those who have authority to send. She claims also independent jurisdiction, on the undeniable ground that the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Rome, as acknowledged by

the early Councils of the Church and confirmed by the civil power, never extended beyond the Suburban provinces around the city and the adjacent Islands. He, therefore, had not primitive jurisdiction in Britain, and consequently could not claim lawful mission there. Nor did he ever exercise any there until about the A. D. 600, when Augustine extorted from the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of the southern part of the Island a reluctant submission to the See of Rome, involving a limited jurisdiction; a grant which was afterwards revoked at the time of the Reformation, by the same authorities that had given it.

With these undeniable facts of history before us; viewed in connection with the further truth, that the Anglican Church, had always been acknowledged, from the remotest antiquity down to the Reformation, as a true branch of the Church Catholic, having the same Apostolic origin, holding the same faith and exercising the same discipline and government; we must confess that we can see nothing but the highest injustice and the deepest injury to historic truth, in classing *Anglicanism* with Novatianism, as on page 367, "it can never generate or uphold a true and valid Church life, in the form of Novatianism say, or Anglicanism."

Is there the remotest similarity between the English Reformation and the Novatian Schism? An impudent attempt to supplant and drive out from the Roman See its lawful Bishop and thrust the unscrupulous author of the schism into his place? The English Reformation was not a work of this kind. It was the act of the whole Church; Bishops, Clergy and Laity, with the Primate at their head. It was, therefore, not schism, but reform: not secession from the Church Catholic, nor rejection of its authorized creeds and ancient teachings; but a reform of corruptions and abuses, and a return to the spirit and substance of early Christianity as exemplified in the faith and practice of the Chrysostoms and Augustines, the Cyrils and Cyprians of the first four centuries.

Thus Rome's usurpations were fearlessly repelled and her thunders despised, as childish imitations of the bolts of heaven, because she never *had* possessed *lawful* mission, nor jurisdiction in England.

A. V * * * * N.

Meadville, Pa.

ART. V.—NEW THEMES FOR THE PROTESTANT CLERGY.

Creeds without Charity, Theology without Humanity and Protestantism without Christianity. With notes by the Editor on the Literature of Charity, Population, Pauperism, Political Economy and Protestantism. Philadelphia: Lippencott, Grambo & Co. 1851. pp. 383.

THE author of this work is a stranger to the public, before which he appears in the volume with the above title. Though a stranger, his book has, notwithstanding, been read, and called forth some reviews, as far as we know, favorable. The subject which the author discusses is Charity, which he conceives has been wholly overlooked in the system of Protestantism. It would be of some service, in order to understand this work, if we knew the spiritual home of the Author, for this would enable us to see more into the interior of the system which he is endeavoring to uphold and carry forward. This, however, has been denied us in the title page, and we must endeavor to discover his home from the general spirit of his book and some portions which may have a bearing upon it.*

In every system, whether philosophy or theology, it is necessary, in order to understand it, to enter into the animus of it; for only by so doing, can it be apprehended and judged. So in every new work which comes before the public, the author occupies a particular "stand point," which must be understood in order that a proper understanding may have place—the merits of it held up, and the demerits criticised and exposed. So now with the book before us. The author was brought up under a system of religion which moulded his thinking and which governs his logic, and under its power he reaches certain ends, in harmony with his own theory. It is seldom, indeed

* Since this article was written, it having been prepared for an earlier number of the Review, a new edition of the work here noticed has been issued, in which Stephen Colwell, Esq., of Philadelphia, is announced as the author.

that we find the powers of mind so developed and drawn out that the individual can break away from the old paths and become, what may well be denominated an independent thinker, and thus originate a new system of philosophy, or of thought. Such minds are rare, and where they are found they are regarded as attaching to themselves, what by many is justly called genius, and then very frequently, draw upon them the suspicions of the narrow minded and bigoted. Whether this is the case with the author of this volume, we doubt, and we will not attribute to him genius, neither will we take away one single laurel he has gained from the manner in which he has presented his subject.

The subject which furnishes matter for this book is one, unquestionably, of great moment. In the view of the author it has been forgotten in Protestantism, and he hesitates not to affix to his title page, "Protestantism without Christianity," using charity in the sense of the apostle Paul. As such an interest, the subject commends itself at once to the earnest consideration of every intelligent mind, with the solemn determination to investigate the charges made against the system which professes to have charity, as the chief of the graces, and if found true, to set about and assist in wiping out the stain and reproach holding against it.

In the preface of this book, the author tells us, that it is not his intention to furnish a complete treatise on any of the topics embraced. The subject, we are told, was long upon his mind, and upon a further acquaintance with it he became satisfied that it was grievously neglected, and that the time had come to invoke special attention to its demands. This is the object of the book. He proceeds to justify himself to some extent, as to the manner in which he speaks of classes of individuals, which, however, will come forward in the main body of the work. He disclaims serving any party, and hence he denounces none, but seeks to stimulate Protestants to come forward and assist in carrying out the precepts of the Gospel which we are told sum themselves up in "Charity."

In entering upon the discussion of the subject he starts out by propounding the solemn question: "Why is it that Christianity has made so little progress in the world?" There can scarcely be a question more momentous than this, and with all earnestness the author proceeds to answer. After having made the admissions which are required in the case, with a firm reliance on the inherent power of truth, when properly present-

ed, he comes to the appalling conclusion, that only one reply can be given to the question, namely: "that aside from the accountability of each individual for himself, the responsibility for the slow progress of Christianity lies at the door of those who profess to be the friends of Christ." This is certainly a startling conclusion. To have it said, that even the very friends of the Saviour, are standing in the way of the progress of the great system he came into the world to establish, which is summed up in the small, yet comprehensive word of *Love*, is certainly a serious charge. In order to make good and substantiate his charge, he proceeds to inquire into the object of the Saviour's mission into the world. This he finds to be the redemption of humanity, by his life, suffering and death upon the cross, and by vanquishing and defeating the powers of the infernal world, and asserting his authority over the same, by his triumphant resurrection, and his ascension into heaven. He thus became a *Saviour*. He instituted a Kingdom, of which he is the foundation, with which he ever abides, according to his own glorious promise. "Lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world," and having planted upon its very front, the three graces, Faith, Hope, Charity, these three, but the greatest of these is Charity. To carry forward and fully plant this spiritual kingdom upon the earth, was the object of the apostolic mission, and after them their immediate followers even unto this present time without any interruption. On this point, however, we conceive the book to fall in with our common infidelity, as we will endeavor to show in the proper place. For the sake of distinctness and convenience, the author quotes from the New Testament, about fifteen pages, intending thereby to show what the Saviour has taught upon the great subject of Charity, making his extracts especially from Christ's sermon on the Mount, and the sublime declarations of the beloved apostle John. No one can read them without being struck how little it tallies with the spirit we have manifested in our day, on every hand, around us. It is sufficient to justify suspicion against any system which makes loud boasts, but produces no fruit. Its constant exclamation now is, in the language of Phariseeism, "Stand back, for I am holier than thou." "We are right, you are wrong." How little does this comport with the Christian system, as represented by the inspired apostle John, "Little children, love one another." From the teachings of the Bible, it is true, as the author says, that the grand truths of the Gospel are to be

received not merely by the ear, but by every avenue which the heart opens up, when hearts are drawn by the silent, yet powerful influence of example, showing first, by example, that we possess really that which is to be taught to others. It matters not what our profession is, if the fruit does not correspond. What is Protestantism with all its professions, if the vital principle of the Gospel be wanting? If it can say to the poor outcast, in rags and poverty, "Be ye clothed, be ye warmed," when it only remains with the lip, of what value or benefit is it, or ever can be to the world. True and genuine Christianity aims at the abolition of all this—it exalts the humble beggar to a free position, which will recognize in him a brother, and he can say with as much right as the pious crowned monarch, "I am a king," and both having part and lot in the same Hope, are fellow travelers for a blissful eternity. We say this is the object of Christianity, and this principle was fully carried out by its Author when he condescended to wash the feet of his disciples, and in case of the early Christians who nursed and watched over the sick, both heathen and Christians, in times of pestilence and war, which extorted from the lips of the enemies of Christianity, the memorable confession, "See how these Christians love one another." This was carrying out the cardinal principle of the Gospel. But when we come to look for it in our day, we look in vain. It must either have been lost, or a necessity created, which demanded a change, or else the system we now have and in spite of opposing forces are endeavoring to carry forward, is something different, *toto coelo*, from that which had place among the apostles and early Christians. This very fact is cause for alarm; for either we must have outgrown the apostles and early Christians in wisdom, which is not likely, or else we may be hewing out for ourselves cisterns which can hold no water.

It becomes then a very interesting and important problem, to ascertain the cause why so little progress has been made. Our author charges the system directly with a want of the proper principle, namely, Charity. If this be true, another very serious question presents itself: Has Christianity developed itself in accordance with its own principles, or may we not have foreign elements mixed in, so that we are now engaged in upholding a system which is not Christianity? These are questions now which force themselves upon our consideration, and it betrays a stupid mind and a want of proper feeling and

insight into the great subject of Christianity, if we can "rule them out" by a mere flourish of the pen.

What then is the face of things which the religious world presents? What is the prevailing spirit which now rules? There is but one answer which can be given, and that is, the spirit of sectarianism. This spirit began to manifest itself at once, shortly after the Reformation had commenced, but the grand principle then being private judgment, the originators of new sects claimed equal power and authority with that of the Reformers. The Reformation principle was about to be moulded, for as yet it had not developed itself fully and settled into a particular form. This we see in the "Zurichan prophets." Hence then, a want of power and authority to decide in all cases of a spiritual kind, and asserting obedience, which province always belongs to the Church, as the bearer of truth. Sects then began to multiply and no power was at hand which could curb this terrible monster. Before Luther, Zwingle and Calvin, passed from time into eternity, the principal trunk of the Reformation had divided itself into two great confessions, and how many little sects, in addition, need not here be mentioned. As time rolled on, one sect after another appeared, each claiming the right to read and interpret Scripture for itself, no one daring to interfere or molest them in doing so. On the continent of Europe and in England also, we find sects of all sorts, from the very origin of the Reformation down to the deceived Mormon. But Europe presents a small picture in comparison with our own fertile America. Our motto is, "Liberty and Freedom," both in Church and State. Under this banner, free scope is given to every grade of mind. History shows that the spirit of sectarianism has been very busy. One sect after another is born, without much travail and pain, and arises with the greatest ease imaginable. We have them of all sorts and sizes. The Mormon worships perhaps as reverently as some of his neighbors. One spire after another meets the eye, all pointing upwards to one home, while distraction and confusion reign in our midst. It would be, perhaps, a task to enumerate all the divisions of Protestantism since the Reformation, and that this spirit of division is still going forward, is evident, from the fact that a party lately arose among the Mormons, styling itself the "New Church," with seven rulers answering to the branches of the golden candlestick. Alas! what light! What makes this picture more sad, is the fact of an overbearing Phariseeism on the part of all our sects,

when we are hearing the continual cry, "We are right, you are wrong." This spirit of condemnation falls in with the idea of the Church, which is one, but how mean and contemptible does it not appear upon the lips of our modern sects.

It may be asked now, Is this spirit of division necessarily included and comprehended in the principle of Protestantism? It is not our intention to discuss this question, as this would lead us away from our present design, and we will merely remark, that it is either comprehended in it or else the Reformation has developed itself falsely, that it has not been true to its genius and laws. Either position is alarming, but yet one or the other must be true, so that one horn or the other of the dilemma must be chosen. If we say the former, then the Reformation stands condemned at the very start—if we say the latter, then it would seem as if there were a necessity to make the experiment, *de novo*. But our common Protestantism does not seem to see or feel the force of the objections which lie against the system. They will tell you, we are all one in reality, as was discovered by the world's convention at London, where perhaps Infidel and Turk could have united and joined hands with the advocate of Christian Union. If we all are one, why not realize the prayer of the Saviour, by coming into a close and vital union? Why so many confessions, if this be true? Why must each sect stand for itself to the exclusion of all the rest? Alas! this boasted union is only imaginary. The only place it does seem where individuals meet in union, is on the broad platform of the Tract Society, and there the union, of course, is of the character proposed and sought after by the "members of the world's convention." It sounds harsh upon the ear, when we hear the Tract orators say, that if they cannot meet anywhere else in union, they can here on this broad platform—they can leave their respective sects to which they belong, and come together here and shake hands, when in heart and real sentiment they are as divided and as far from each other as ever. They can say, Hail brother, when with the concealed dagger they are prepared to stab him under the fifth rib. Instead of savoring of a Christian spirit, it is the very essence of Infidelity. To hear men, and that Christian men, talk of meeting on this latitudinarian platform, and shake hands and do that which they cannot do in the Christian Church, the body of Christ, smacks strongly of some element foreign to Christianity. Is it possible that the Tract Society develops the great cardinal truth of Christianity, Charity, which the

Christian Church cannot do, to which it belongs as one of the three graces? Such an admission would be fatal to the very existence of the Christian Church. But yet what does this fact prove? Simply this, that the Tract Society has taken the place of the Christian Church, and the Church has failed to develop her own grand principles. This is the infidelity of the orators which make their appearance at its anniversaries. It shows, furthermore, the idea some men have of the Christian Church, and also their idea of Christian union. It seems to them, that the Church is a body of men associated together for the advancement of some common end, and the Church is often, in this view, called a Society, with powers similar to that of the Odd Fellows and Sons of Temperance. So too with Christian union. It is an outward coming together, a shaking of hands, with pleasant, smiling faces, when heart may be arrayed against heart, as deadly as ever before. Alas! for such ideas of these glorious truths; when, we may ask, will they ever be realized? Protestantism, with such conceptions, must ever remain separate and divided.

Sectarianism has had full sway since the time of the Reformation, whether it belongs to the system or not. Let us then examine into its spirit, in order to discover the principle which rules it. In the history of sectarianism, we have a large mirror where each one appears to advantage, after having applied the proper paint, and then in it will appear images, each answering to the original as projected by the author. The hero of each sect speaks and paints for himself, and the confusion which appears on the mirror, reminds one of a spiritual Babel. The Bible is honored and venerated by all, (except perhaps the Roman Catholic, as we are told) and it is really wonderful to hear so many different notes produced by striking the same key. The spirit of the Bible, as we all know, or at least ought to know, is peace, brotherly love, kindness and above all charity. But what is the spirit which rules the religious world? It is not that of love. Each sect feels itself called upon to carry out its peculiar mission, and this must be performed in the best manner possible. It sets out then in its appointed crusade, taking captive all that fall along the way, for which sometimes unprincipled measures are adopted and carried into effect. There is a spirit of opposition, no one can deny this, actuating the different sects, which enters into their zeal and activity. Christians of various branches are arrayed one against the other, and with this emulation they set to work to

labor in the Lord's vineyard. It cannot be disguised, that a certain feeling of jealousy and envy is harbored between the different sects, which often leads them to undue length. Where this is the case, party zeal and party spirit are encouraged, which often take the place of the Christian virtues. These worldly elements mix themselves in with those that are Christian and give us a perfect alloy, the original being adulterated, having lost in value and worth. The spirit actuating the sects is a destructive one. They all appear upon the battle-field fully equipped with royal, spiritual weapons, drawn of course from the Bible, and with these they proceed to do execution. They can censure and blame others, and at the same time glorify themselves, and then proceed and act over the very acts censured and condemned in others. Every movement of these sect champions tells us that they are engaged in a deadly conflict, endeavoring to gain the mastery, not over Satan and his spiritual allies, but over their colleagues who likewise call themselves Christians. This is not only the case here but elsewhere, so that instead of saying, Behold how these Christians love each other, you are forced, reluctantly, it may be, to say, See how they hate each other. But we may be told this is a holy emulation. Why then not manifest a proper Christian feeling and spirit? If the principles of Christianity actuate the sects, why the bitter discord and selfish spirit so often witnessed? No, the reason seems to be a want of the spirit of Christ. Charity, the keystone in the Christian arch, is wanting, without which, all our professions will be heartless and vain. Is it any wonder then, that there is such an amazing amount of infidelity and worldliness, when the world looks on and sees these fruits developed from professed principles. Sectarianism then is opposed to charity and instead of having the Christian world united and drawn together, which should be the case under the banner of Christ, having charity inscribed thereon, we behold a constant repulsion, but no attraction. And why is this? In the language of the author, the fault lies at the door of the friends of Christ. They are divided, their interests come into conflict and clash, and progress, under such circumstances, must be very slow and uncertain. The stigma lies then full upon the followers of Christ, who profess to be the salt of the earth.

But another deduction is to be made from these facts. This monstrous system not only clogs and fetters the wheels of the Gospel car, but is decidedly opposed to vital piety and religion.

What is the form of piety we often find in our miserable sects from Alpha to Omega? We discover a certain mould—a certain type into which piety is cast. It may be made to take in the holy laugh or develop itself into the long beard which must worship in this way and no other. As soon as it is removed from its moorings, it is restless and uncertain, and yet piety should be constant and regular, having deeply and extensively infused into it the principle of charity, the very substance of the Gospel. Piety, in our sects becomes sectarian, bigoted; reminding one of the parable of the Pharisee and Publican: "Stand back, for I am holier than thou." If this is the effect which vital piety has on the heart, then the pious Christians (not sect Christians) of other times were greatly deceived. Charity then must be set up as the mark, it is the aim towards which we must all look, it must be more extensively infused into our Protestantism, in order to prepare it for reaching the great end before it. Whether this can be done under its present form remains a problem for future solution. Taking this view, the position of the author remains, namely, a want of charity on the part of those calling themselves Christians, which accounts for the slow progress Christianity has made, and the one-sided individual, sectarian piety which we find developed in all the sects. Whether this is the spirit of the Gospel commanding us to "deny ourselves and to take up the cross and follow Christ," is not for us now to say.

We turn now to another phase of this interesting book. We have seen that sectarianism offers no soil for the growth of charity, and that the system is detrimental to personal piety. We have said that the author has some spiritual home, the atmosphere of which, moulded his thinking. This his book clearly shows. Where it is remains a mystery still, but he develops his hatred to creeds, confessions, catechisms, &c., and with many of the sects of our day he advances forward with the torch manufactured by himself, and the little light he gets through his own glasses. In this way, we fear, he destroys the very principle for which he contends. He becomes a powerful advocate of private judgment, and the free use of the Bible, the very principle of sectarianism, so that each one can see and understand for himself. This, as we have said, is the very soul, the very principle of every sect. There is no sect, from the Reformation down to this time, that does not insist fully as much on having the Bible and the free use of reason, as our author. Even the Roman Catholic loves *his* Bible, and his Church was

the guardian of it before the Reformation commenced, or any of our sects were born. Every sect cries out, The Bible and private judgment, no creeds, no confessions, no catechisms, why be hemmed in by these boundaries, why not let us do as we please? We have the Bible, we can read and interpret for ourselves, and we love freedom and hate restraint. No wonder with this idea that we have such a Babel. We would not wish to be understood as denying private judgment or the use of the Bible; we would only contend for the proper use and not abuse. This, by the way. Such is the principle of this hateful system, and in it no charity can grow. The food that nourishes it is denied it, its roots are cramped and it is at best, such as we have it, but sickly and drooping. The author is careful to say that he is no advocate of the idea, that it is immaterial what men believe, and yet he tells us, each one is to read and interpret for himself and so come to the truth. This involves a contradiction. He believes what he does, because he grew up under the spirit of that confession, be it written or unwritten. If he is a Quaker, he grew up under the influence of Quakerism and inhaled that atmosphere. It matters little whether he have a written confession or catechism, the thought, the leading ideas have become fixed and settled, and growing up under this, with an open Bible in the hand, he becomes as much the slave to his confession, creed, or catechism, as any one who studies a written confession or memorizes a written catechism. And under these circumstances is there room left for the growth of charity in such soil as this? We fear it is individualism, as we had it before. So the author says among other things,

"Every man, with the Scriptures in his hands, is bound to search them anxiously, carefully, and with an honest desire after the truth: it is his duty to supply himself with all the help he can, both from books and living teachers; but in the last resort he must believe for himself and not by another; his belief must be built on his own convictions, and not on those of another. A man's religious mind, the state of his soul in its relations with religious truths, must be made up from his own investigations, decisions and exercises, and not those of another. He is bound to perfect himself in belief and practice, to the utmost extent of his capacity: and no doubt all men fall short of their duty in this respect. It is obviously absurd to bind men by creeds and confessions, and expect them to keep together and be uniform in faith or speculation.

Such efforts can only produce a seeming uniformity, and exert a decided influence towards hypocrisy or want of candor." Page 42 and 43.

Here it is said that uniformity cannot be attained, and he becomes thus an advocate for the wildest sectarianism, running it into gross individualism, the very curse under which the religious world now lies. Can Christian charity find a home in such rank infidelity as this? We have our doubts. But now let us see what ground there is for the opposition to confessions, creeds, catechisms, &c. 'Tis true, if they were but mere "indices," we might do without them, and then if found in error they could easily be corrected, and tinkered into shape, or, if this would be too much trouble, the matter could be left at rest, as nothing is gained or lost. We beg leave, however, to differ on this point. We confess ourselves suspicious, and have doubts as to the safety of such procedure. For our own part, we would never choose such a tinkerer for *our* spiritual guide. Our fears would be aroused, and we would always feel that we had no guaranty that the substance of our faith would not be tinkered out of shape, so that our poor soul could find no place whereon to rest. This too belongs to the system of sectarianism. It hates creeds, confessions, catechisms, &c., and true to its spirit, it puts into shape whenever any become warped by usage or time. True to this spirit, the Augsburg Confession has suffered vastly. The Smaller Catechism has felt the same violent hands. And yet this spirit, with all its mutilating and even rejecting, will stand up and say, *this is the substance of our faith—this is our creed*. The spirit, as we have said, is true to itself. It hates instead of loves. Under its ruthless hand the system of Truth always changes, so that if you wish to examine it, "you must shoot it on the wing," for it will not remain at rest long enough for you to take deliberate aim. It is sheer individualism. If this be right—if it be true, where have we the guaranty of truth? Is truth so changing as all that? If so, then religion becomes, of all things, the most uncertain. But truth is ever the same, Christ himself is the personal truth, with whom is no change. He is the same, yesterday, to-day and forever. And can we for a moment suppose, that since his advent to this time, it continued to change, clear out of shape, so that some skillful hand was needed to bring it to its original shape? Christianity has a shape—a substance of its own, this cannot vary as our sects tell us. It was truth when the personal truth was in the flesh, and con-

tinues so for all ages. This life must be preserved and according to the promise of the Saviour, he is with his Church always even to the end of the world. It is delivered from one age to another and the doctrines of the Church we have then in the creeds of the early Church, which have been handed down even to our times. The very fact that so little account is made of these early creeds, embodying the faith of the early Church: the very fact that even the venerable confession, the Apostles' Creed, can be corrected, shows the avowed hostility against all symbols, ancient or modern, and is in perfect harmony with the destructive spirit to which the enemies are sworn. This spirit carried out to its legitimate consequence gives us the locust-swarm of sects, each one with an open Bible in the hand, as a matter of course, and reading into it its system, barren as it always is, as it is apprehended by the private judgments of its hero. Here again, as before, under such individualism (not piety,) charity finds no home and no soil in which it can grow. It withers and dies.

After these points are disposed of, on which we conceive the book to fall in with the radical Protestantism of the age, the author endeavors to point out the law of charity as manifested among the early Christians. The relation in which the Saviour is made to stand to slavery, is something wholly different from what we find among our modern abolitionists. As he is the great author of freedom itself, he proclaimed no law against its existence, nor against those who were the more immediately interested and concerned in the transaction. The only rule which he enforces is that of Love, infusing this great motive power into the hearts of those who heard him, and thus taught them to do as ye would be done by. Under this powerful influence the spirit of emancipation commenced and was carried forward, and in proportion to its prevalence, was the power and activity with which it was carried on. This spirit of emancipation was spiritedly entered into, until the internal power or force was interrupted or in a great measure destroyed, which showed its effect upon emancipation at once. All the mighty effects produced, seem to have been effected under the influence of charity, the chief of the graces. Charity had effect not only on the institution of slavery, but produced powerful manifestations in every department in which it could find room to become active. Hence we are informed that the principle of charity manifested itself powerfully, in ransoming the captives taken in war and doomed to slavery. "One of the

marked characteristics of Christian kindness is seen in the liberality exercised in ransoming from slavery its constant recruits. In many cases whole communities were impoverished by their efforts in this way, and instances are not wanting in which men sold themselves into slavery to procure the means of redeeming others. When Genseric took and pillaged Rome, he carried off a host of its best citizens, as captives, and landed them at Carthage, in Africa, where, husbands being separated from wives, and parents from children, they were sold into bondage. Christians at Rome sent after their unhappy brethren all the means they could command towards their redemption and relief: but the prisoners found Christians in Africa. Deogratias, bishop of Carthage, gave himself to the work of recovering these slaves of Vandals and Moors. To prevent separation of families he purchased a large number of them. The churches of Carthage were fitted up with beds and furniture and became the habitations and hospitals of those who were descendants of the former enemies of that city. To meet this great expense, the gold and silver ornaments and vessels of the churches were sold. Medical attendance and nursing were liberally bestowed upon the numerous sick. The good bishop day and night gave his personal superintendence and aid to this great and good work, and this under the weight of a feeble old age." A. D. 450. pp. 68, 69. Surely these were exhibitions of the principle of charity, of which, modern, Protestantism can furnish no parallel. The author now follows charity in all its manifestations from the early Christians on to the period of the Reformation. His idea of the exhibition of the principle becomes somewhat confused and irregular through the period that follows. Monasticism, we are told, originated at an early day. In the course of time it grew to a great and powerful system. The influences which it exerted upon the world, are beyond computation. The Church claimed of right the control. The wealth of her members was poured into her lap and her pulse of charity told upon all ranks of the community. She had it in her care "to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to redeem the captive, to aid in the cure and care of the sick, the infirm, the halt and the blind, and for the support of a generous hospitality." The charity of the Church, was manifested not only in her midst and among her own members, as is the case now-a-days with our miserable sects, but as genuine charity always will, its manifestation was seen everywhere. "When the plague raged in Alexandria, in the time of the Emperor Gal-

lian, Christians distinguished themselves, in contrast with the pagan population, by their undaunted courage and persevering care for the sick, dying and dead. They omitted no duty and fled from no contact in the care of those laboring under the frightful malady, in closing the eyes of the expiring, in cleansing the bodies of the dead, and in carrying them to their graves: and as fast as the ranks of those thus exposed were thinned by death, others stepped in to fill their places. These sacrifices were made not only for Christian brethren, but for the heathen, who were deserted by their own families, and left to die without a single attendant, in the streets as well as in the houses, and their bodies to go unhearsed and unburied." pp. 71 and 72. The very fact that we have such powerful exhibitions, in this early age, shows clearly that charity was not something mechanical in the Church, as we find it in our day, but that the life of Christ was infused into his followers, which brought about these glorious results. But this spirit of charity is to be traced through the whole period of the Church, even to the very threshold of the Reformation, and from thence onward even to our times. If this be true, which Church history establishes beyond a doubt, then it follows that there was a real continuation of the kingdom of Christ upon the earth, which had not become extinct, even through the dark ages of our author. Where we find the Gospel principle of charity unfolded and developed, as was the case through this period, we are forbidden to adopt such an infidel conclusion. The very principle which he upholds and shows to have been at work even then, is fatal to his Church during that period. There is no other conclusion possible; for either you must say that Gospel charity is possible beyond the pale of the Church, where Christ is not; or you must admit that all was effected in the bosom of the Church. If we take the first, we may as well scatter the Church to the winds and join hands with the infidel, and expect salvation without coming to Christ. But this point need not now be pressed. We have said that the system of charity did not cease its exhibitions with the Reformation. It continues even until now. The Catholic Church always had regard to this great cardinal truth. In this respect she has produced saints, and when we come to compare her operations with those of our miserable sectarianism in every form, she throws all far in the shade. The spirit of charity, as in the bosom of the Church reached necessarily her members, and we find in her, some of the noblest examples of self-denial in

the sphere of charity. The influence which was exerted upon the world through the charitable zeal of Bernhard and Anselm before the Reformation and of Hay and others since, cannot be told. Whilst the sects of the Reformation were engaged in warm and angry discussions and debate, and in their blind zeal "left large regions uncultivated, when they quarreled about their several boundaries, whilst the land on each side was running to waste," the Catholic Church was engaged in developing still further, in a practical way, the great principles entrusted to her. "It is clear that opinions have, by these contests, been magnified into undue importance, and these disputes have absorbed time and attention which belonged to other subjects. They have given a harshness and severity of outline to sectarian differences, at once forbidding and unchristian." p. 93. "If we examine the articles, confessions of faith, creeds, and catechisms of Protestants, if we look into their controversies, if we attend their convocations, conferences, conventions and assemblies, we find that the burden of the whole has been doctrine, theology and Church government. The Scriptures are searched unceasingly, . . . and may not this study of the Scriptures have been made too subservient to sectarian opinions and too little conducive to the active duties of Christian love?" pp. 94 and 95. Protestantism, as we have it now, seems to have no time for the unfolding of this great cardinal truth, and what we have in it, in the way of liberal contributions and bequests, do not spring from a heart overflowing with Christianity, from which charity springs. The tracts on systematic beneficence do not reach the subject. The object is not to bring about a system by which to contribute, but to have the heart imbued and filled with the spirit of our ever adored Saviour, and then will every heart say, "Behold Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor." Our beneficence is selfish, and it may have place with the infidel as well as the Christian, and no doubt now has; but this is not Gospel charity, for this, true and genuine, holds only in connection with vital piety. In bleak Unitarianism, it is a plant which cannot grow, and so too in our selfish sectarianism.

From this point now it is easy to see over into the enclosure of the Church, as it is fashioned by our author. On this point, it is to be feared, he falls in with the reigning infidel notion of the age. But let him speak for himself. "All the errors of Romanism were not left behind by those who came out of that Church. The idea of a great mysterious organization, a hea-

ven-ordained corporation, which is the medium of communication between Christ and his followers, still clings to the minds of many. The disposition to Judaize, 'tithe mint and rue, and pass over judgment and the love of God,' has not been exhausted, but has been visible in every age since the days of the Apostles. 'Lading men with burdens grievous to be borne,' 'putting yokes upon the necks of disciples,' has been done in modern times, and continues to be done, until a further reformation takes place, or until men become too enlightened to be fit subjects for such spiritual domination." pp. 96 and 97. It is difficult to see what idea of that glorious order of grace, "the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all," the author of this book has. In his view, Christianity is magical, reaching the individual somewhere from the clouds, without any constituted order or method. With him history, and especially Church history, is made up of "bits and fragments," loosely thrown together, like the stone upon the heap, without any vital connection. You can take any number off and you still have the heap. With this loose notion, you can do anything with history and the Bible. Our Protestantism can be patched to anything prior, and with all imaginable ease dissect the body and then commence and put together a better subject than the master hand, Time, ever could. No wonder that some portions in the history of the Church are dark and gloomy. No wonder, with such an idea, that they can abuse and ridicule history with all the slang infidelity can command. But what else is it than joining hands with Voltaire, Hume and Gibbon. It is a denial of Christ. The author's view, if we can apprehend it at all, is to be freed from all spiritual domination, to cast to the winds creeds, catechisms, confessions, not to say anything of such an order as the Church, to disrobe her priests and let every one silently and quietly, in his own way (is this freedom of conscience?) take his Bible and read for himself, and find the way to heaven. Why have the *pfaffen* to tithe and domineer over the people? What use for any order? Why not have each one to start for the kingdom in his own strength? This spirit, discountenancing all these means and orders, now turns and out of respect, calls the Church a Society, where persons club together and assist each other to reach an end which could not be reached so well in any other way. To talk of the Church as an order of divine grace, which Christ instituted in the world, as the bearer of life and grace to a fallen world—to say that she is

the mother of all God's children, smacks too strong of Romanism. With a deadly hatred towards the Catholic Church in which were born our Reformers and to which we trace the origin of our respective families, they rush into an extreme on the other side and tell you we claim nothing of this. Our religion, our Christianity comes from the Bible, this is our warrant, to this we must turn. So, and what becomes of the Saviour's promise, "Lo I am with you always?" Where was his body? Of course, according to them, in the Bible, from thence it was dragged forth to light. What a conception of the Body of Christ as compared with that of the apostle Paul. To the Ephesians he says, that God "hath put all things under His feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." And to the Colossians, "He is the head of the body, the Church," "We being many are one body in Christ." "As the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ." "Therefore he saith, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men, . . . And he gave some apostles and some prophets and some evangelists and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come into the unity of the faith in the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, &c." In these passages the reality of the Church is clearly held up, an idea contrary to that of the author. St. Paul, here shadows forth the Church under the figure of a body, and then raises the figure into a reality, so that the example or argument, passes by a sort of transfiguration into the mystery of Christ's mystical body, as when he says, "We are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." To speak in addition of the ancient formula, *Extra ecclesiam, nulla salus*, and the ancient faith, "he that hath not the Church for his mother cannot have God for his father," would be horrible and shocking to their conceptions. The view of the author differs from all this, and yet in this we are told are to be developed the different graces spoken of in the Gospel, faith, hope, charity. But in such barren soil it is easily seen, they cannot, they will not grow. What we have here is only a bastard production, fit for nothing. No wonder then that the Protestantism, which has this view, never developed the principle of charity. It demands some-

thing fairer, such as pure Evangelical Protestantism as we have it in the palmy days of the Reformation.

From the view which the author takes of the Church, the relation which the individual sustains to her must necessarily follow. He regards the Church as a Society, established as a convenience, and men come together here to reach ends, which could be reached without her. So he says, page 97, "To step in between the soul of man and his Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, to assume the office of a mediator between them, or of arbiter and absolute interpreter, is an act of usurpation so daring and impious as to be incredible, if our knowledge rested on less evidence than our eyes and ears. This intervention of man between God and his creatures, is not at all confined to members of the papal Church. The assumption is not strange in the Protestant world. The Gospel is to be preached to every creature: instruction is to be given to every extent that is practicable: those for whom it is intended are to receive it humbly and teachably, exercising all their faculties to understand and digest: but the opinions then formed, the faith then built up, and the working of the affections then excited, the union between God and the soul then formed are operations wholly between God and his subject, man, in which no Church or ecclesiastical agency or office can have any share. The sooner men are made to feel, individually, and as masses, the great fact that their eternal salvation depends not upon any Church or form of religious organizations, but upon their individual reception of the truth—not upon their union with any religious denomination, nor upon their observance of any forms or ceremonies, or mode of worship, but upon their individual union with God in Christ, the sooner will Christianity acquire a new progress and surmount the barriers which now retard its movements." This view cuts off the ancient formula, *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. The author would look upon the early Church fathers and their faith, "as an act of usurpation so daring and impious as to be incredible," and hence there is no use for such an institution to usurp individual rights. The author speaks of "the teachings of Christ," of "the reception of truth," but where, we may ask, is this truth to be found? Is it in the world, is it everywhere? Then Christ must be so, for he is the personal truth. Then again, how is it to be made over to us? In the view of the author, all is sheer magic, his religion—his idea of piety is magical, and being so, is nothing at all. Can charity find a home here? It is hard to see how. And yet in this

magical way he contends for something which cannot develop itself in such barrenness and nihilism as this. In what way, we may ask, did grace reach the pious Jew? Was there not a necessity for him to come into contact with the order of grace, instituted by Jehovah? *In the temple*, the Shekinah dwelt. *There* the priest sacrificed. Thither the Jew had to come. This was the command of Jehovah. Might not the Jew have reasoned just as rationalistically as our modern rationalists, and said, why such an interposition on the part of the priest? Why not every one worship and sacrifice as would best suit himself? Why go to the temple at all? Why not do all this at home? But no, the command of God was to go *there*. With the devotions there the blessings were connected. And so in the Christian system of grace. There is need for the chosen ambassador of God. The Christian Church is the channel through which grace is made over to the people. She is the body of Christ, and beyond her, we have no way revealed how any spiritual life can exist and reach those on the outside. As such an order, there must needs be shepherds, ambassadors of God, organs through which blessings are to be made over to the people. It was so among the Jews. The people then were united to God through the priesthood and the temple. Of such a bald, abstract notion, as the author holds up, the Old Testament order knew nothing. There was a system of grace. So in the new dispensation. The Saviour chose his apostles, the people were not indiscriminately called, but through the chosen vessels of the Saviour. The apostles healed diseases, performed miracles in his name. Divine power passed over upon the deceased through the apostles. If this be so, which no believer in the Christian system can deny, it follows that the relation which the individual sustains to this order, is as the members to the Head. These are united, not outwardly, as the stone upon the heap, but organically, and that *through the body*. The individual cannot cast aside the Church, for through her he is united to the body of Christ. He alone is the door into the sheep-fold. "No man cometh to the Father but by me." But he is in his "body the Church," and hence connection with him must have place in the manner and way appointed and instituted. Let us not climb into the fold some other way for fear of being denominated "thieves" and "robbers," but come through the door, which is Christ. The author contends for charity in the system which he upholds and presents, whatever it may be, but it is the very same which we now have, the wide,

accommodating latitudinarianism, which has not produced it, and it may be inferred that unless penetrated with proper contents, never will. As it now stands, it seems to be destitute of the very principle.

With the author of this book, the end which the glorious Reformation was to reach, and which was reached, was to rescue the sacred Bible from destruction and loss, forgetting, of course, that "numerous editions of the Bible were published in the principal languages of Europe, under the patronage of Popes, Cardinals and Bishops, long before Protestantism came into being . . . In our own country, the Catholics published not less than twenty or twenty-five editions of this Holy Book, of every size." What became of these editions that were published, if they did not reach the people? As the Reformation then was called to this work, the great subject of charity was neglected, and in all the creeds, confessions, catechisms, &c., according to the author, it is not once named. What an idea of Christianity, which requires rules for every form and department of our human life. This was not the object of the Reformation. That was to assert, over against the Romanists the clear doctrines of the Gospel, the doctrine of justification by faith, without works, in the sense of Popery, nor to make and adopt rules for the government of life. The object was to plant the principles of the everlasting Gospel deep and firm, so that they might spring forth and develop themselves into glorious fruit. This has been the case where the planting has been proper, and where proper conditions for growth have been at hand, the fruit which must necessarily follow has never been withheld. Charity then, does not so much enter into the conception of Christianity—the subject here is Christ. It belongs not to the *Creed*, but flows forth from it rather as the golden fruit. So the obedience of the moral law, he obeying it, must practically love God and in reality love his neighbor. So of the individual who finds Christ in the Church, having his heart and mind penetrated with his spirit, will, as a necessary consequence, bring forth fruit and proper works, such as the Gospel demands, without producing which his profession is vain, and becomes as sounding brass and tinkling cymbals.

So the author says: "The Reformers took the Bible in their hands, reared the standard of truth, swept off the rubbish of Romanism, and erected the fabric of Protestantism, but overlooked, in their readings of the New Testament, its imperative injunctions of brotherly kindness. Their building was massy,

of noble and severe outline: its frame-work of truth was of impregnable strength, yet it was cold, forbidding, and uncomfortable: it was neither warmed nor lighted by charity . . . Look into the theology of the Reformation and see if it be not subject to this reproach. It is a form of Christianity with charity left out: and yet if this form implied a strength of faith which 'could remove mountains,' it would be 'nothing.' It is a monstrous technicality: it is sculptured marble, white and beautified, but rigid and unfeeling." pp. 111 and 112.

If this be true, which we are not prepared to endorse, how, it may be asked, can Protestantism bring forth charity, seeing that in all its principles the idea is excluded? It is vain to hope for it, and it is a form of Christianity then, destitute of the very principle of the Bible. It may have faith to remove mountains, &c., but without charity it is sounding brass and tinkling cymbals.

In perfect keeping with this idea, and under its influence, have efforts been put forth for the relief of the world. Devoid of all charity, the Gospel, such as it necessarily became in hands destitute of proper principles, it claimed triumphs everywhere. Everywhere activity and energy have been widely manifested, but these, according to the author, have not been always according to the pure motives of Christianity. Our civilization and modern achievements may after all owe very little to the influences of Christianity. So he says, "The energy which has achieved so much in Great Britain and the United States, and other Protestant countries, has not always been controlled by the pure motives of Christianity. No, far from it." Speaking then of the success through two centuries, he says, "Yet the full benefits of Christianity have been brought home to a few only of those who have enjoyed all these advantages. It may be feared that not a tenth of the people of any Protestant country can be truly claimed as having been unfeigned disciples of Christ, taking their ministers as judges." pp. 122 and 123.

A very serious charge. But in all candor, it is to be asked, does it not contain too much truth? Is not the ministry (I mean the person, not the office) given too much to selfishness, and taken up with the world? It is too plain, and something which cannot be denied, that dollars and cents too often rule the minds, and it is to be feared the hearts too, of many who profess great love for Christ.

As to the systematic beneficence, of which we lately had a

good deal, the author views it in another light, and to us, with a great deal of force. He shows that often the men of the world rule whole congregations, and he says, page 128, "The whole expenditure of Protestant congregations of almost every denomination, for every purpose, religious and philanthropic, is derived, in a large degree, from those who are not acknowledged to be real disciples of Christ." "It would be impossible to distinguish in all this work what share is taken by those of whom it is said 'It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God,' but it is well known they partake largely and wield an important influence. Money in too strong a sense, is the main-spring of a large portion of this activity: remove this spring and the machinery would stop. Whence comes this money? It is not the voluntary offerings of crowds who come up cheerfully and pour their contributions into the treasury of the churches. It is levied, nay even exacted, by a system and under influences which do not permit denial; under such penalties as the givers are afraid to incur. It has become a great business to raise money for religious and benevolent purposes. A man may live in the house of another, if he pays the rent: he may own real estate in any county, if he pays the taxes: so he may have a seat in the house of God, if he pays its assessment. He may occupy a respectable position in the Church, and in the society around it, if he contributes liberally, when called upon, to all numerous demands which religious and charitable associations make upon him. It would be hard to conjecture how much of the money levied in this way would be got, if it were left to flow in solely by the spontaneous movements of the contributors. Certainly a very small portion. It is a regular system of business, this systematic benevolence; and if this feature be taken away, the whole must fall to the ground, unless some other life be breathed into it. A vast amount of good may be done, many good Christians may mingle in these labors; yet this system is not Christianity, nor has it the purity or vitality of the Christian system." pp. 130, 1, 2.

Such extracts like these are frequently in this book and we have here made them for what they are worth. At the same time, they lay open a sore which it is painful to behold. That alas! too much of what the author charges upon Protestantism is true, cannot be denied. Our time will not permit to enter further into the subject. His appendix we must leave untouched.

Enough has been said to show that our present state of Protestantism, or in other words sectarianism, cannot produce the fruit for which the author contends, and it becomes us then as upholders of it, to see to it that such awful charges as are made be rolled off and legitimate fruit produced. What are all our professions if devoid of fruit? Sounding brass and tinkling cymbals, and of such worth too much, with sorrow and regret be it said, is by far the greater portion of our present Christianity.

It is not our intention to enter into a discussion of the subject of charity, as the length of this article already forbids it. We would merely say, "that charity or the love of God is the greatest thing he can give us: for himself is love: and it is the greatest thing we can give to God: for it will also give ourselves, and carry with it all that is ours. The apostle calls it the bond of perfection, it is the old, and it is the new, and it is the great commandment, and it is all the commandments: for it is the fulfilling of the law. It does the work of all other graces, without any other instrument but its own immediate virtue. . . . It is a grace that loves God for himself: and our neighbors for God. The consideration of God's goodness and bounty, the experience of those profitable and excellent emanations from him, may be, and most commonly are, the first motive of our love, but when we are once entered, and have tasted the goodness of God, we love the spring for its own excellency, passing from passion to reason, from thanking to adoring, from sense to spirit, from considering ourselves, to an union with God: and this is the image and little representation of heaven: it is beatitude in picture, or rather the infancy and beginnings of glory."

We now take leave of this book, being assured that the subject it presents is an important one, the revival of which we greatly need, with the hope, that, objectionable as it is in many respects, it may be widely circulated and extensively read, and be the humble instrument in bringing Protestantism to see that the very cardinal principle of the Gospel is, to a great extent, wanting in its midst.

H. M. E.

Cavetown, Md.

ART. VI.—THE GROWTH AND MISSION OF THE CHURCH, WITH THE MEANS BY WHICH IT MAY BE SECURED, APPLIED SPECIALLY TO THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH.*

THE history of the Christian Church is one of various trials and fortunes. It has its dark as well as bright spots; for whilst there have been periods in which the Church has gone forth in her might and power, conquering and subduing her proudest foes, as in the early ages of Christianity and at the time of the glorious Reformation; there have also been periods when she has appeared greatly cast down and afflicted, as if deserted by her glorious head and king. But various as the changes have been through which the Church has been called to pass, in her struggles with the powers of earth and hell, she still lives the pride and glory of the world. And it matters not how fierce, or violent the conflict may yet become, she will never be overcome, or lose her existence amid the sands and deserts of this world, but true to herself, she will continue to arise and gain one conquest after another until all opposition shall be brought to an end and her light and glory appear as the sun in his brightness. As this, however, can only be effected by fierce and violent conflicts, during which many a pious heart may despond, like the children of Israel when they hung their harps upon the willows, and wept, let us consider *how the Church, and particularly that portion of it, whose special claims it is one object of this Review to advocate, may attain her full growth and strength, and so fulfill her mission in the world?*

Before we, however, proceed to give a direct answer to this question, it may not be amiss to make some remarks upon the rise and growth of the Church, which, like the development of life under every other form, is gradual, requiring the presence

* This article contains the substance of a discourse preached at the opening of the Synod of Ohio and adjacent States, at its last annual meeting.

of certain conditions to complete and perfect it. It may indeed be said to be God's usual plan in accomplishing his purposes, not to effect them by any sudden, or extraordinary display of divine power; but by a steady and gradual process, which although it may be slow in its operation, is sure in the end to surmount every hindrance and opposition. The tall and sturdy oak, for instance, does not instantaneously spring up to perfection, as by some magical force; but the seminal principle which lies in the acorn gradually unfolds and develops itself according to the laws of its own life, so that years are necessary under the most favorable circumstances, to complete its growth. So it is also in reference to the whole vegetable kingdom—the seed is first cast into the ground, after which we have the tender plant, then the blade, then the blossom, and last of all the full grown ripened fruit. So too it is with the life of man, certain stages and conditions, must necessarily be passed through before it can reach its highest and ultimate form. And what is thus true in the sphere of nature, is equally true of the life and power of Christianity; for here also, according to divine appointment, there is a process through which the Church must pass before she can reach her ultimate state of development. The Bible never represents Christianity or the Church, as something that is full grown and complete from the start; but as tending and pressing forward to a state of perfection, "at the restitution of all things," when the tabernacle of God shall come down and dwell amongst men. This is evident to every one at all familiar with the teachings of Christ upon this subject. "The kingdom of heaven," said he, "is like unto a grain of mustard seed, which a man took and sowed in his field, which indeed is the least of all seeds, but *when it is grown*, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof." (Math. 13; 31, 32. This, not to say anything of the other parables of our Lord, touching upon this subject, clearly teaches that there is a process, or state of development, through which the Church must pass before she can attain her full growth in the establishment of the new heavens and earth in which God shall be all and in all.

This growth or enlargement of the Church is no mere accumulation of parts thrown together in a loose and outward way. It is no addition of individuals and nations to the number of the faithful in the same way in which a man would fill up a given number by making constant addition to it from with-

out, any more than the same thing may be predicated of the growth of the plant, or of the human system. The Church is no aggregation of individuals thrown together like the particles of sand: but is everywhere represented in the word of God as a living unit, all of whose parts spring from one common root and centre, and which are therefore held together by the presence and power of one common life, just as all the leaves and blossoms of the plant are but the evolution of the power lodged in the seed. Hence, when we speak of the growth of the Church, we do not merely mean that there is an increase in the number of them that believe, or that there is an enlargement of the territory which it covers; but that there is also along by the side and at the bottom of this an internal development of its life which has been continually making itself felt by a deeper and more thorough penetration and transfusion of itself into everything that pertains to the interest of man. This does not, of course, imply that there is any change in the nature or essence of Christianity, so that its contents are not the same at any two given periods of time, any more than there is any essential difference in the plant at different stages of its growth. All the life and power which the Church now possesses, or which she may hereafter possess, even though it be an hundred fold greater than it now is, was comprehended in her constitution from the start; so that when we speak of the growth, or enlargement of the Church, we mean nothing more than the evolution and development of its life in the actual history of the world, which always remains true to itself, notwithstanding the various outward forms it may assume.

This, as we have already remarked, is gradual and steady in its character. *The kingdom of heaven cometh not with observation.* It is by no violent or revolutionary measures that it seeks to establish itself in the world. Its weapons are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of the strong holds of Satan. Its conquests are made, not by fire and the sword; but by the silent and secret penetration of its spirit into all the different forms and departments of life with which it is brought in contact, which it gradually transforms into its own divine and heavenly image. And although we may not at all times be able to discern its onward course, in consequence of the various hindrances and obstructions which may for a time, apparently, retard its progress, yet it is still all the while operating secretly and powerfully, like leaven, and will in due time authenticate its divine character by surmounting all op-

position which may lie in its way. It is thus that the Church as to its rise and growth is carried forward in the world, which, although it may be slow in its progress, so that centuries may pass away before it reaches its ultimate form, will, nevertheless, press forward with inward necessity until its mission is accomplished, in the subjugation of the world to Christ, when all things shall be made new, and the Church appear without spot or wrinkle or any such thing.

Such now being the nature of the rise and growth of the Church as a whole, we may naturally expect the same to hold true of every part that is animated by her true life and spirit, so that it is not to be expected that the various divisions of the Church which have any right to a separate existence, can fulfill their mission in a day or month; for if this should ever be the case with regard to any of the existing denominations of our land, it would be a most conclusive evidence that there was no just occasion for any separation in the first place, and that those who were active in bringing it about, were actuated more by self-will, and vain glory, than a desire to promote the glory of God in the salvation of men.

For wise and important reasons, which we may not be able fully to comprehend, God has permitted the Church of the present age to be rent into various fractions and divisions. This we do not regard the true and proper form of Christianity, but consider it at variance with the unity of the Church, which is one in Christ; but as God has permitted it for a season, in order that the different sides or phases of Christianity may in this way, perhaps, the more effectually be carried forward to their ultimate form, and so at last be blended together as a living unit, it becomes the solemn duty of every portion of the Christian Church to consider well its peculiar mission, with the means by which it may the most speedily be effected. And believing, as we do, that the German Reformed Church, although not numerically as strong as some of the other denominations of our land, is pervaded with the true spirit of Christianity, and forms a part of the body of Christ, it becomes a question of deep and solemn interest to us, to know how she may arise to her proper glory and strength, and so fulfill her mission in solving the difficult and mighty problem of Christianity. *By whom shall Jacob arise? for he is small.* This is a question well worthy our serious and prayerful consideration.

Let us not, however, in making the admission, that our denomination is numerically small along side of some of the other

tribes of God's Israel, be understood as implying that the German Reformed Church is a weak and insignificant body, whose existence may be swallowed up in that of other denominations, without any particular loss or detriment to Christianity as a whole. This, we are aware, is the light in which we are sometimes viewed and represented by those who are either ignorant of our history and character, or desire to deceive our people, and so bring them the more easily into connection with their own particular organization, which they have vanity and presumption enough to believe to be the most perfect embodiment of the life and power of Christianity. Such a view, however, is as false as it is presumptuous; for the claims of the German Reformed Church are not to be thus ignored and set aside. She is no plant of yesterday's growth, which may be expected to drag out a sickly existence for a few years, and then cease to be, leaving others to effect what she had not the power to do. She claims for herself a character as honorable and legitimate as that of any of the other denominations of our land. Her history is most intimately connected and intertwined with the history of Protestantism itself, and is filled with incidents of such thrilling interest, that any one who has been cradled and reared in her communion may be proud of the connection. Her origin, as a distinct branch of the Church of Christ, she traces back to the period of the glorious Reformation, when the Church was led from her captivity out of the Romish communion, where she had been oppressed by dead formalism and corruption, to the more advanced position of Protestantism, which has since been the main stream of the life and power of Christianity. Nor was she a mere idle spectator of this great and mighty struggle in which the Church gained such a signal victory and triumph over error and corruption, but was one of the chief actors in the scene. And as no one, not blinded by prejudice, would think of calling in question the legitimate character of the Reformation as a work of God, so it would be equally presumptuous to deny the divine character and mission of the German Reformed Church, which embodies in its constitution some of the most prominent and essential features of this great and mighty movement, to be unfolded and carried out in the actual history of the world. Her founders were among the leading spirits whom God chose and honored as the instruments, which were to effect the deliverance of the Church, and lead her to the lofty position which she so fearlessly assumed in the sixteenth century. If it were

at all necessary, we might here bring forward a host of names of blessed memory, which stand in intimate connection with the German Reformed Church, and give prominence to her history and character. We might appropriately speak of Zwingle and his co-adjutors, who commenced the work of reforming the Church as early as the year 1516. We might mention the name of Calvin, of world-wide renown, distinguished alike for his giant intellect, ardent piety, and logical precision. We might speak of Ursinus, of immortal memory, as the chief compiler and expositor of the far-famed Heidelberg Catechism, which will forever remain as a monument of his greatness and piety. We might speak of the devoted and lion-hearted Schlatter, whose untiring missionary labors contributed so much to the establishment of our Church in the wilds of America. Yea, we might greatly extend the list by recalling the names of others whose praises will be in the Church till time shall end, all of whom were active in establishing and carrying forward to its present lofty position, this portion of the Church of Christ. But surely nothing of the kind is necessary to give us a true idea of our character and mission, and to inspire us as their lawful successors with a holy zeal to do honor to their memory by carrying forward to its ultimate form, the work which they so nobly commenced, and for which they were willing and ready to sacrifice their fortunes and their lives.

To us, then, it is no question of doubtful character, whether we should at once go forward with true and hearty interest in building up the German Reformed Church as a separate and distinct denomination, or suffer her existence to be lost and merged in the other divisions of the Church of Christ. Our duty evidently is to go up and take possession of the land that stretches out before us, white unto the harvest. We have already hesitated too long, and so lost some of the fairest and most inviting portions of our territory, which have fallen into the hands of others, whose zeal and devotion to their particular interests should cause us to blush. Our brethren, who are scattered in every part of the great West in a state of destitution, are calling to us, in imploring strains, to send them the word of life, and not force them to lose their connection with the Church of their fathers and their choice.

And why, we might here ask, when our brethren of other denominations are striving, with a holy zeal and emulation, to strengthen and enlarge their borders, should we hesitate and

falter in building up this old and venerable Church of the Reformation? Has she shown less zeal in advancing the interests of vital godliness and purity of doctrine than other denominations of our land? Is her name less honorable, or her ancestry less remarkable for their piety and devotion to the cause of God? Is her Catechism, which she has received and expounded with hearty interest for nearly three hundred years, and which has, perhaps, been admired and praised more than any other, less orthodox, or practical in its tendency, than those of later date? Is no regard to be had to the wrong that would be done to the religious character and feelings of thousands, who would be deeply grieved if told, that, henceforth, they must move in an entirely different religious atmosphere from that which pervades the German Reformed Church? Or can any other denomination of our land as effectually fulfill the mission which God has assigned us? If not, why should any one hesitate to devote his time and talents, as thousands have already done, to the upbuilding of this portion of the Israel of our God? Rather let us buckle on our armor afresh, and devote ourselves, with renewed interest, to this great work. And believing, as we do, that there is but one voice among us in reference to this matter, let us now proceed to show how we, as a Church, may arise to the position which God designs us to occupy along side of the other denominations of our land.

By whom shall Jacob arise? for he is small. Small numerically, but entrusted with a great mission. Small, and yet not the weakest of all the tribes; for, when we look at the immense territory over which the German Reformed Church stretches in our country, not to say anything of her existence in the father-land—when we look at her membership, numbering nearly 100,000—her ministry, not to be surpassed in self-denial and devotion to the cause of Christ—when we look at her churches, with their spires reaching to heaven—when we look at her institutions of learning in the East, and West, and South, and her papers and periodicals, which find their way into thousands of families, and which have spoken in tones that have been heard in the distant portions of our country, awakening the most earnest minds to an investigation of truths of the deepest interest and importance to the Church at large—when we consider all this, she rises before us already in solemn grandeur, although not full grown and complete, which leaves room for the inquiry, *how may she arise and fulfill her mission*

in the world? which is the question we now propose to consider; and, in doing so, we would remark,

First of all, that, if the German Reformed Church would ever arise and fulfill her mission in the world, it is of the highest importance that she preserve *her true spirit and genius, together with every thing peculiar to her as a distinct portion of Christ's kingdom.* Every denomination that stands in living connection with the Church has a spirit peculiar to itself. And though we may not always be able to define, in clear and intelligible terms, what this is, as distinct from the spirit which lives and breathes in other portions of the Church, yet every one, who allows himself to think at all upon the subject, is conscious of its existence. Who does not feel, for instance, that the spirit and genius of Lutheranism are something very different from those of Methodism? So every one feels that the religious life and atmosphere, which we find in the Presbyterian Church, are not the same as those which exist in the Episcopal Church. The same remark is true of the German Reformed Church; for, whilst we have much in common with every other denomination that stands in organic connection with the Church as a whole—whilst we love them all in as far as they are pervaded with the spirit of Christ, and desire to live upon terms of Christian fellowship with them all, we are, nevertheless, not one and the same with them, but have a spirit and mission peculiar to ourselves. If this be not so, there cannot, in our view, be any satisfactory apology for the present divided state of the Christian Church. To us, it is a clear case, that if the type and spirit of religion be one and the same in all the denominations of our land, it is a most wicked thing to mar the unity and strength of the Church, as is done by the many fractions into which it is split. If Lutheranism, Methodism, Episcopacy, Congregationalism, Presbyterianism, and every other *ism* of our land, be one and the same in every respect, the sooner the walls which now separate them from each other can be broken down the better. The only ground upon which it is possible to allow and advocate the existence of separate denominations is, that each one has a spirit peculiar to itself, and that its mission is to exemplify, and carry forward to its ultimate form, some particular side, or feature, of Christianity, and that, when this is done, its separate existence will be lost in the general stream of the Church, which, at last, to complete its unity, will be outwardly as well as inwardly one.

Assuming it, then, as an established fact, that the German Reformed Church, although small when contrasted numerically with some of the other portions of the Church of Christ, has a spirit and genius peculiar to itself, it is a clear case, that, if she would ever prosper, and fulfill her mission in the resolution of the difficult problem of Christianity, *she must remain true to herself*. Instead of endeavoring to see how closely she can imitate and conform herself to the religious life of other Churches, it is of indispensable necessity to her future growth, that she become conscious of her own true life and spirit, that she may the more effectually preserve and cultivate them. Just as soon as elements, foreign to her own peculiar life, are permitted to find a place in her communion, will her peace and unity be disturbed, and she become the abode of strife and contention. How often has the truth of this remark been verified in the history of more than one of the denominations of our land? Nor does it require more than a very partial acquaintance with our own past history, as a Church, to see its correctness as it respects ourselves. Every one at all familiar with the rise and growth of the German Reformed Church, knows full well that wherever she has been fairly represented, her true life and spirit unfolded, her doctrines faithfully preached, her order and purity maintained, and her customs prudently observed, she has gradually arisen to strength and eminence; whilst, on the other hand, wherever there has been a departure from this course, and customs and usages have been introduced, foreign to her true life, even though they may at first have been attended with the most striking results, which lead their fond, though deceived, admirers to believe that they would effect great and mighty changes, their ultimate tendency has been to weaken her energy, and create misgivings and strifes, which have spread like a pestilential atmosphere, over some of the loveliest portions of our Zion, blighting every fair prospect. How sacredly, therefore, ought not we, to whom God has entrusted the interests of this portion of his heritage, to guard against any and every innovation foreign to our genius and spirit, as a Church? The moment we become reckless in this respect, we may inscribe in large and legible letters upon our standard, *Ichabod—the glory is departed*.

From what has now been said, we may infer that what we need more than anything else to secure our future growth and prosperity, is not, as some might suppose, any great and sweeping change in the present order and constitution of our Church

—it is not the introduction of any new forms and customs more in accordance with the maxims and opinions of the world—it is not any new symbol of faith which shall be less positive in its doctrinal statements—it is not a reconstruction of what our fathers have done and handed down as a precious legacy—it is not the substitution of a name, which shall fall more pleasantly upon the ears of those whose sensibilities seem to be shocked by the mere mention of whatever is German in its accents—instead of any and everything of this kind, we need to become conscious of our own peculiar life and genius, as a Church, and to be fully pervaded and penetrated by them.

To enter into anything like an accurate or extended description of what the peculiar genius of the German Reformed Church is, would be foreign to our object, and would, at the same time, be a repetition, to some extent, of what has been well said in a small, though interesting work, published a few years since at our Office of Publication, on *The History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism*, to which we refer those who may desire information upon this point. It may not, however, be amiss to state that what is peculiar to us as a denomination, appears with special prominence in every question and answer of our Confession of Faith, which we profess to love as a true and faithful exposition of the doctrines of salvation—it is seen in our liturgy, in our prayers, in our hymns and forms of devotion—in a word, in the literature which has sprung from the very heart of our Church, giving expression to her true life and spirit in words that breathe and burn. And whilst upon this subject we cannot refrain from making a passing remark upon the importance of supplying ourselves with a denominational literature. As yet little has been done in this respect. Our attention has thus far been directed mainly to the cultivation of the immense territory which has stretched out before us, which has left but little time for patient thought and study. And as a matter of course few additions have been made to our literature as a Church, whilst the labors and researches of our fathers, who being dead, yet speak, have been suffered, to a very great extent, to lie buried in languages which but few of our people could either read or understand. The time, however, has come for a different course of action, and it is a pleasing fact to know that this want is now being very generally felt, as may be inferred from the commencement that has been made within the last few years, to meet this deficiency, and the avidity with which our people have laid

hold of whatever is denominational in its character. Nor is it difficult to see the happy influence which such a literature would have upon our future growth and prosperity as a Church. Its natural tendency would be to remove much of the prejudice and ignorance abroad in reference to our true character and mission—it would arouse the Church to self-consciousness—it would contribute to a more active and intelligent state of piety—it would place within the reach of our children the means by which they might grow up to a proper understanding of the origin, progress and doctrines of the Church of their fathers—in a word, it would secure all the advantages which other denominations are now reaping, by having their literature spread broad-cast over our land.

And why may not the German Reformed Church have a literature adapted to her own peculiar wants as well as any other portion of the Church of Christ? She has her own separate and distinct mission to fulfill, and needs, as much as others, to be excited and encouraged to the faithful discharge of her duty. She has abundant means too at hand for the accomplishment of this desirable object, in the rich legacy which we have in the writings of the founders and fathers of our Church, so that if we were to do nothing more than reproduce, and make accessible, what is already at hand, we would have a literature of which we might well be proud, the influence of which would soon be felt throughout the length and breadth of our Zion. Surely, then, it is high time for us to awake to our interests in this respect, if we would not lose our separate, individual existence as a Church. And may we not hope that the time is not far distant when the importance of this matter will be so fully felt that those whom God has blessed with an abundance of the good things of this world will come forward and make liberal donations, as has been done in other Churches, so that we may at once go forward without any embarrassment, in supplying this desideratum.

But important as all this is to our future growth and prosperity, it is not all that is necessary; for unless we faithfully and diligently employ the agencies that are necessary to develop the life and spirit peculiar to us as a Church, it will be of but little consequence to be made acquainted with its distinguishing characteristics. We need, therefore, in addition to a consciousness of our own peculiar life, the presence of such conditions as will unfold and develop it in the actual history of the world, until we have accomplished the mission, which God

has assigned us. For it is with every denomination that has any right to a separate existence, as it is with the Church as a whole: it requires a gradual process which may run through a long period of time, before the tendencies and principles which are comprehended in its constitution are evolved and carried forward to their ultimate state of perfection. What then are the conditions necessary that the heaven of Christianity lodged in the German Reformed Church, as a part of the household of faith, may unfold its true character, and accomplish its appointed object? These are various, so that we can merely refer to such as are of special importance, and leave it with every one to carry out the subject in his own mind.

I remark, then, as worthy of special notice under this part of my subject, *that a ministry adequate to our wants and necessities*, is of great importance to our continued prosperity in the world. Every one at all familiar with the extent of territory that rightfully belongs to us as a Church, knows that our present ministry is altogether insufficient, numerically, to meet the demands that are made upon us. Many regularly constituted congregations and charges are without the regular and stated means of grace, not to say anything of the hundreds of points that are suffered to lie in a state of spiritual destitution, in consequence of not being able to secure the services of a Pastor. The number of our ministers, therefore, needs to be greatly increased, in order that we may properly and successfully cultivate the field that God has assigned us. But important as all this is, it is not the main thing that is needed in our ministry, that the religious life of our Church may be properly developed; for if this were all, the deficiency might easily be remedied by the accessions that could soon be made to our ranks by holding out the proper inducements. Invitations have been readily accepted to our large and influential congregations, when they have been extended abroad, which we might naturally expect would continue under the same circumstances. But would this be calculated to carry forward the growth of the Church in a substantial and healthy form? This may easily be determined by a reference to our own past history, or that of any other Church which has, to any great extent, practiced this policy; from which we may learn that this would be the most suicidal course we could adopt to destroy everything peculiar to us as a Church, and paralyze our life and energy. We need a ministry, it is true, sufficient to cover our immense territory, which is every day widening; but then it

must be of a peculiar stamp to meet the wants and realize the hopes of the Church. A ministry that might move with ease and labor efficiently in the Episcopal, Baptist, Presbyterian, or even Dutch Church, is not just exactly what is needed in the German Reformed Church to secure its growth and prosperity. For if it be true, as we have already shown, that the German Reformed Church has a genius and life peculiar to itself, it is easy to see that no ministry that is not fully pervaded and transfused with these, can effectually meet its wants and accomplish its mission. Hence, what is wanted more than any thing else in the ministry that shall subserve the purposes of this portion of the Church of Christ, is not so much intellectual and theological culture, eloquence, philosophical learning, or metaphysical acuteness, important as these things are in their place, as to be eminently Christian or Christ-like, in the sense in which this may be affirmed of us as Church; or to use the language of another, "it must be the living counterpart of what constitutes the fundamental principle of our symbol of faith." Such a ministry as this, although it may be greatly deficient in what the world considers necessary to insure success, will, and must make itself felt, in unfolding the true life and genius of our Church, as may be inferred from our past history, which has been one of more than usual success within the last few years. Men who have been accustomed to look at matters only from their own peculiar stand-point, which is often not a little contracted, may become alarmed at looking at its bold and striking results, and raise the hue and cry of "heresy," "Romanizing tendency," and a thousand other evils, until the confusion becomes equal to that of Babel, yet it heeds it not, further than to blow the mist away from its own clear perception, so as to go forward in the accomplishment of its own appropriate work. This is the ministry we need to secure the growth of the German Reformed Church and to enable her to fulfill her mission in the world. And it is of the utmost importance to our future prosperity as a Church, that immediate and earnest efforts be put forth to meet this want.

In close and intimate connection with such a ministry, we may here, without making any extended remarks, merely mention as necessary to unfold the peculiar genius of our Church, *the permanent endowment and support of our theological and literary institutions.* Past experience fully corroborates the fact that no denomination can attain any great permanent growth without its own institutions of learning which shall embody

and give expression to its peculiar life and spirit in a scientific form. And if there has been any one thing that has contributed more than another to retard our progress in days gone by, it has without doubt been the want of properly endowed and supported institutions of learning. Had we from our first establishment in this country provided an institution that would have been to the German Reformed Church, what Princeton has been to the Presbyterian Church, who can calculate the influence it would have had upon our growth and prosperity. It is too only in this way that any denomination can effectually supply itself with a ministry adequate to its wants and necessity, and preserve its peculiar and distinguishing features. Let those who desire to see the German Reformed Church rise in her greatness and strength and so unfold her true character, not stop in their efforts until our institutions of learning, which have been started under such favorable auspices in the East, West and South, be placed upon such a substantial and permanent basis, as will invite the youth of our Church and country to come and drink of their crystal fountains; and let the Church have a particular care that those who are called to preside over these institutions be men, who shall possess, in an eminent degree, the life and spirit peculiar to us as a denomination, so that the streams which issue from these fountains shall partake of our true character, and soon their fruit will be seen in every part of our land, making glad the heritage of our God.

Another thing of great importance to us as a Church, that we may fulfill our mission in the world, *is the necessity of a more thoroughly digested and extensive system of Church extension than any that has hitherto been in operation among us.* All the different denominations of our land are beginning to feel the special importance of this subject, and to give it the attention which it demands. And if this be true of those whose missionary field is comparatively small, what special claims should it not have upon us, in view of the immense territory which stretches out before us. For in addition to the emigration that is continually going on between the different States of our Union, we have to provide the word of life for the immense foreign German population that is annually landed upon the shores of our happy country. Hundreds and thousands of these have already been scattered in all our different cities, towns and villages. These persons must be supplied with the stated means of grace, or else they will be ensnared by the

specious and deceptive forms of error, that are abroad in the world, and so endanger the stability and perpetuity of our free institutions. And to whom can they so justly look to have their spiritual wants supplied as to the German Churches, in which most of them have been reared and educated. As our missionary field is, therefore, extending itself so widely, we must, if we would not be treacherous to our interests, adopt such measures as will meet the wants of our brethren, who are allied to us by such close and tender ties. We must, if we would not lose our territory and give over to others, what properly belongs to us, have not one, or a dozen points supported by our missionary contributions, but have our pioneers and missionaries in all the different states, territories, cities and towns, where our people are found living in a state of spiritual destitution. If this be not done, much of our ground will be wrested from us in a comparatively short time, in consequence of our own indifference and inefficiency.

But important as all this is, it is not of itself sufficient to accomplish the object contemplated; for unless there be at the same time a *spirit of missions*, which shall pervade our entire Church, so as to take possession of the hearts of our people and prompt them to great and generous acts, no system of Church extension, however well digested and adapted to the wants of the times, will be of any great account. Hence, it is of the greatest importance to our future growth and prosperity as a Church, that all proper measures be employed to awaken, and extend such a spirit throughout the length and breadth of our Zion, that the time may soon come when all our waste places shall be repaired, and the wilderness bud and blossom as the rose.

But we have already extended our remarks farther than we had intended, and can, therefore, merely allude to other points intimately connected with our future growth as a Church, upon which we might dwell with propriety, amongst which we may mention the necessity of greater union of effort in all our attempts to advance the interests of our Zion—the necessity of a spirit of greater liberality and forbearance—the necessity of more devotion and zeal in the cause of Christ, with confidence in him as present in his Church directing and controlling all things for his own glory and the salvation of men; but we must leave the reader to carry out in his own mind, these and other thoughts, which may suggest themselves in connection with our subject.

Such then are some of the things which we regard as of the utmost importance to the German Reformed Church in her future growth and history, that she may fulfill her mission in the world. And who is there that can have any serious doubts of their efficiency? They are the means by which she has overcome one difficulty after another until she has reached her present position by the side of the other denominations of the land. Let us then, with these weapons of our warfare, go forward with full confidence in Him who has said, "Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," and we may expect to see still greater evidences of the presence and power of God in our midst. Wherever we look, our eyes and hearts will be cheered by indications of solid and substantial growth. Year after year, when we come together in our ecclesiastical assemblies, to review the mercies and dealings of our heavenly Father, all will be constrained to say in delightful astonishment, *What has not God wrought?* The Church will go forward in unfolding her true life and spirit, until at last her mission is fulfilled, in her full growth and development, when God will say to us as the instruments through which it was effected, "*Well done good and faithful servants, enter into the joys of thy Lord.*"

Columbus, Ohio.

G. W. W.

ART. VII.—ROMANIZING TENDENCIES.

THAT there are strong Romanizing tendencies at work in many sections of the Protestant Church is a fact which it is useless to deny. We judge of tendencies by their results, and recently, as we are aware, the conversions from Protestantism to Romanism have been alarmingly numerous. These conversions are not only from the ranks of the illiterate and ignorant; but some of the most learned, scientific, and earnest men of the age have left the Protestant ranks and embraced the Roman Catholic faith. We might here mention the names of Professor Philips of Berlin, afterwards of Munich, Stalberg, Schlegel, Veith, Moliter, Beautain, Dr. Newman, with his many respec-

table associates, Mr. Brownson, Dr. Huntingdon, Bishop Ives, &c. Such conversions as these have been the occasion of great exultation and triumph amongst Roman Catholics, and of fear and alarm amongst Protestants. To account for them upon the hypothesis, that these men have been actuated by selfish and iniquitous motives, is by no means satisfactory: for, in many instances, there was no sinister motive to be gratified; but, on the contrary, the step taken required the utmost self-denial and sacrifice.

When, in the sixteenth century, such men as Luther, Melancthon, Jonas, Osiander, Brent, Agricola, Zwinglius, Bucer, Oecolampadius, Haedio, and others of the same spirit, felt themselves called upon to renounce Popery, it was an easy matter for their enemies to impugn their motives and traduce their characters; but the deep and powerful religious movement of that age was not to be accounted for in any such outward and summary way. So, on the contrary, the fact that some great men of our day feel themselves called upon to renounce Protestantism and embrace Roman Catholicism, is not to be explained by the supposition, that they are men of doubtful character. If it were a settled fact, that Roman Catholics and Roman Catholic converts are all a set of knaves, as their enemies would have us believe, we need feel but little concern about the "Romanizing tendencies" of the age, or about the ultimate success of our Protestant cause.

Let us acknowledge, that those who differ from us in their faith and their views, are as honest as ourselves, and endeavor to account for the "Romanizing tendencies" of the present age in a more rational and satisfactory manner. By a careful examination of their nature and ground, we shall discover, that they do not spring from a healthy Protestant Church theology as such, or from a true Protestant churchliness; but from the spurious and counterfeit Protestantism of our day. To start the question whether a sound Protestant theology, or true Protestantism, can be anything else than churchly, were to insult the memories of the Reformers of the sixteenth century. The thought never entered the minds of these great men of encouraging abstract confessions of faith and abstract systems of thought: they were deeply imbued with the spirit of *reform*; but not with the spirit of radicalism: they issued their protest, not against the Church as the bearer of the Saviour's life in the world, and the standard bearer of divine truth; but against the enemy which had come in like a flood, threatening to de-

stroy the entire heritage of God. They stood out as firmly against the radicalism and fanaticism of that age, as against the disorders and corruptions of the papacy itself. Their great object was to *reform* the old Church, and not by any means to become the founders of new sects. "The Reformation was quite the opposite of a revolt; it was the re-establishment of the principles of primitive Christianity;" it was the effort of the Church herself to throw off the diseases, that had long afflicted her body; it was the development of a powerful and a vigorous Church life, showing that Christ had not forgotten his promise to his people: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." The voice of Protestantism is the voice of the ever living God in the Church of Christ, denouncing error and sin in whatever form they may appear. The spirit of Protestantism is the spirit of Christ revealed in the Church, warring against the spirit of antichrist; and the principle of Protestantism is the principle of divine life, which starts in the person of Christ and unfolds itself in the Church, which is his body.

Protestantism comprises three things: these are the name, the faith, and the Church; or, in other words, the appellation, the confession, and the Church. The name, all admit, is in this acceptation a novelty, which originated in the sixteenth century, and as late as the days of Luther. The patrons of the Reformation in Germany protested, in 1529, against the unjust decision of the Diet of Spires, and in consequence were called Protestants. An old institution, therefore, came to be distinguished by a new name. Protestantism, in its modern and ecclesiastical application, began to signify Christianity. But changing a sign does not change the signification. Britain, according to the ancient appellation, is now called England, without any change in the territory. The ancients called that Hibernia, which the moderns call Ireland. France was formerly named Gaul, and Columbia lately Terra Firma; whilst these divisions of the European and American continents, notwithstanding the new designations, remain the same. "But the name itself is not important. The sign is nothing when compared to the signification. The antiquity of the Protestant faith is easily shown. The theology of the Reformed is found in the Bible, in the fathers, in the primitive creeds and in the early councils."* Catholicism, *not popery*, according to the

* Edg. Variations, p. 6.

primitive designation, and Protestantism, as rightly understood, are *identical*. This view might be sustained by many of the most credible and respectable witnesses.

The idea that God is in history was often advanced by the Reformers. "The world," said Luther, "is a vast and magnificent game of cards, made up of emperors, kings, and princes, &c. The pope for many centuries beat the emperors, kings, and princes. They yielded and fell before him. *Then came our Lord*. He dealt the cards: he took the lowest for himself, and with it he beat the pope, that vanquisher of the kings of the earth. . . . This is the ace of God. As Mary said: "He hath put down the mighty from their seats and exalted them of low degree." "The history of the Reformation shows," says Dr. J. H. Merle d'Aubigne, "that nothing new can be made out of things old; and that if, according to our Saviour's expression, we require new bottles for new wine, we must also have new wine for new bottles. It directs man to God as the universal agent in history,—to that divine word ever old by the eternal nature of the truths it contains, ever new by the regenerative influence it exerts; which purified society, three centuries ago, which restored faith in God to souls enfeebled by superstition, and which, at every epoch in the history of man, is the fountain whence floweth salvation."

Hence it was that the Reformed recognized and professed their faith in the creeds of the ancient Church. The Apostolic, the Nicene, and Athenasian formularies of belief were adopted by the Protestant Church and have been distinguished by their general reception in Christendom. The confessions of Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Gregory, and Lucian, were also regarded as orthodox, and were venerated and esteemed. This accounts for the remarkable degree of harmony, which characterizes the different confessions of faith that made their appearance in the Church during the Reformation period. Though they appear under a diversity of form, it is evident that they are all the product of a previous Church life, and not the productions of single individuals who had ignored the history of the past. The fact, that Catholicism and Protestantism are identical, and that the Church of the Reformation is the continuation of the ancient Church, and not a new organization, is also evident from the systems of theology and the general evangelical literature which appeared in the sixteenth century. In all these writings, as well as in the confessions, do we hear the Protestants in Germany, Switzerland, France, Holland,

England and Scotland, professing with one voice: "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." The object, that was present to their faith as thus professed, was a *real, Holy Catholic Church*. Whilst, in their view, Catholicity and Apostolicity were ideas distinct from, and opposed to the errors of the papacy, they were, at the same time, opposed to unchurchliness and rationalism. Protestantism is then purely Catholic and historical. It is the religion which squares fully with the idea of humanity. It is the historical development of the Church which is built upon Christ, the Apostles and Prophets, whose dominion will extend till all the kingdoms of the world shall have become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ. It is the Church of the living God, coming up out of the wilderness, with garments dipped in blood, going forward to the land of Canaan and the City of the New Jerusalem.

From this, it must follow, that the piety and theology, which are the most churchly and catholic, are also the most decidedly Protestant; and, on the other hand, that piety and theology, which are the least churchly and catholic, are also the LEAST PROTESTANT. Whatever the sects, that have separated themselves from the historical Church, may affect to be, they are *not Protestants*. The Protestant Church does itself an immense wrong by awarding to the sects its own name. All classes of men, no matter what they are, if they do not belong to the Roman Catholic communion, are now-a-days acknowledged to be Protestants. No matter how rationalistic or infidel the sect, no matter how vile and wretched the characters, who step forward to oppose the papacy, they are regarded as champions of the Protestant cause. From such advocates, good Lord, deliver us. Let all, whom it may concern, know that the sects and infidels are *not* Protestants. They could never be owned as such by the Reformers. "It is only in the Church that the Gospel of Christ is fully taught, and rightly understood; for the various sects, such as the *Ethnies*, the Philosophers, Jews and Turks, are either entirely ignorant of it, and thus reject it; or else, they add to their errors what little they have culled from the doctrine of the Apostles, the use of which, however, they do not properly apprehend nor understand, as is true of the Arians, Papists, Anabaptists, and all other heretics; some of whom hold errors concerning the office of Christ, and others concerning the person of Christ, the mediator. These great distinctions prove that the doctrine of the Church alone should be taught and held fast to, whilst the

doctrines and religious systems of the sects, which oppose the truth, should be rejected and shunned, as the perversions and wicked devices of the devil; according as it is written, "Beware of false prophets." "And keep yourselves from idols." (Math. 7: 15. 1 John 5: 21.)*

It must also follow from the premises here laid down, that true churchliness, or a sound churchly theology, *cannot* tend to Romanism. It is just as unnatural and impossible, according to the established laws of history, for the Protestant Church as such to become Roman Catholic, as it is for Christianity to return to Judaism; albeit, Christianity came from Judaism, and Protestantism from Roman Catholicism. "Salvation is of the Jews." Those persons, therefore, who, in their superior wisdom, have decided, that the churchly theology of our Reformed Zion is Romanistic in its tendency, are rather wide of the mark. It is common, however, for persons riding in steam-boats and railroad cars, to imagine that the trees and other objects which they see, are moving with incredible rapidity. So the sects and unchurchly denominations and individuals may easily imagine, as they are rapidly sailing towards the regions of light, that the Church, which stands firm on the platform of the ancient creed, is fast floating in the opposite direction. These by-passers are continually warning us of the danger to which, as they conceive, we are exposed; they cry continually, "Beware of the beast, beware of antichrist, have no fellowship with the works of darkness." They are not aware, that, in their way of escaping from Rome, they have left the Church of Christ itself in the rear; they have lost the very *idea* of the Church, the ministry and the sacraments. To be churchly, sacramental, liturgical, is in their view, to be Roman Catholic. So they will have it, in spite of everything that can be said to the contrary. "We will defend," say they, "the faith once delivered to the saints; we will preserve the legacy bequeathed to us by our pious forefathers; the Bible is our religion, and our worship is spiritual." Deluded souls! do you not know that, in taking the Bible from the ark of the covenant, you have committed theft and sacrilege, and that the spirit of God does not rest upon those who dishonor his Son, and the means of grace which he hath ordained? Do you not know, that the branches that are cut from the vine must wither and die? Do you not know that your subjective piety must become extinct,

* Dr. Ursinus' Com. page 4.

if it be not sustained and nourished by the objective in religion? Have you yet to learn that no man liveth to himself, and that there is a communion of saints?

But we are gravely told: "That which has been may be again. Catholicity once gave rise to the papacy and its accompanying evils; therefore a churchly theology may again tend to the same evil end." This statement can only hold in a modified form. Not everything which has been can be again; the world cannot again be destroyed by a flood;—Abraham cannot again be called from the land of Haran;—Joseph can never again be sold into Egypt;—the Israelites can never again be oppressed by Pharaoh. The types and shadows of the Old Testament dispensation which prefigured the coming of Messiah, being fulfilled by his advent, can never again be fulfilled by the coming of another; the Word can never again be made flesh, as it was when the only begotten Son of God was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary; Christ can never again be crucified; he cannot again rise from the grave and ascend into heaven. No other Church can ever be planted on the Rock of ages, than that which was planted on the day of Pentecost. So the past history of the Church *is past*; the days of her infancy are *past*; her early struggles are over; the ten Roman persecutions can never be repeated; the long and painful discipline of the Church, during the reign of the papacy, is *past*; the power of that reign is broken, and it can never regain its former dominion. The Church has reached the period of her adult age, and she claims the right of breathing the pure air of Gospel liberty. "Not as though she had already attained, either were already perfect; but she follows after, if that she may apprehend that for which she is apprehended of Christ Jesus." She still appears in her mixed character, and, like her once crucified and now glorified head, she bears the marks of her wounds and bruises.

It is readily conceded that heresies, which once sprang up in the Church, may spring up again in a new form; and it seems that, in the same proportion as the Church increases in age, do heresies increase in number and in strength. We are fully aware, that the spirit of antichrist, so graphically described by St. John, and which revealed itself so powerfully in the forms of Gnosticism, Manicheism, Ebionism, Pelagianism, &c., though the sects known by the corresponding names have long since passed away, still lives. Its power is everywhere felt in the Christian Church. The principal forms, under which this

spirit now reveals itself, are Rationalism, Sectarianism, and Popery. It is quite a mistake to suppose, that the spirit of popery is confined to the Church of Rome; it is also powerfully at work in the Protestant Church. As the ancient heresies, however much they differed in form, often ran into one another, thus showing that they all proceeded from one and the same spirit, so the spirit of popery often reveals itself amongst the rationalists and the sects. Rationalism, sectarianism, and all other heresies, however great the number, all belong to the same family: hence we often find full grown popes amongst the rationalistic and fanatical sects; indeed they are found in almost every part of the Protestant communion. Dr. — is a pope, Dr. — is a pope, the Rev. — is a pope, the Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church is a pope. These are the *Liberii* and *Felices*, who are contending for the chair of St. Peter.

But do the heresies spring from the life of the Church or from the diseases in her body? We can easily conceive, that certain persons coming in contact with a healthy Church life, or a churchly theology, may be driven by it either to infidelity or to Romanism; but is this consequence the result of the theology, or of the diseased state of the persons in question? The natural tendency of the sun's light is to warm, to beautify, and fructify the earth; but shining upon marshy places and stagnant waters, it causes putrid vapors to arise, which infect the surrounding atmosphere and spread death and devastation. The natural tendency of the sun of righteousness is to lighten every man that cometh into the world; but we know that the Gospel is to many, not a savor of life unto life, but a savor of death unto death. Does this death spring from the fountain of life or from the diseased state of those who die?

We can easily conceive also that devoted Christians, who are of a melancholy turn of mind, and who look continually on the dark side of Protestantism, may despair of its ultimate success, and giving it up as a forlorn hope, they may seek a connection with the Church of Rome. It is natural for a child, that has despaired of the life of the parent, to seek the protection of the grand-parent; yet, to do so before the parent is really dead, cannot be regarded as proper in any case. We can conceive even of a grave, earnest, and profound theologian, who has done more than any one else to bring the Protestant Church to a consciousness of her advanced position, becoming so much disheartened in the day of conflict and trial, as to give

up the entire cause which he had espoused, and retire from the field, seriously revolving the question in his mind, whether, after all, there may not be more good in the Church of Rome, with all her corruptions, than in this distracted and confused Protestantism. The question here again arises, whether this step on the part of the theologian is the result of his churchly system of theology, or of the terrible evils and sad defects in the Protestant Church. It may show constitutional weakness, or a want of faith; but has the constitution been weakened and the faith destroyed by the system of theology, or by the anti-christian spirit, that spirit of the devil, which, in the name of spiritual piety, and in the form of an angel of light, opposes Christ and his holy truth? True churchliness, or catholicity, so far from being the source whence Romanizing tendencies spring, is the healthy activity which alone can counteract these tendencies.

There is a great variety of motives by which the converts to Romanism have been actuated. Many of them have published their motives to the world, and have defended their course by the most powerful and cogent reasoning. One has made history the study of his life, and by applying the principles of his science, he has been led to embrace the Roman Catholic faith. Another is an artist, and from a love of the beautiful realized in an external form, he goes in the direction of the ancient city. You may hear one draw his arguments from the science of mental philosophy: in the Catholic religion, he conceives, is alone to be found the system adapted to the wants of man. You may read a political economist, who tells you that, having investigated the principles of that science, he was forced to admit that only in the Catholic morality could he discover the principles whereon it could be honestly conducted.* Another has been discussing the principle of social rights, and has thus been led to embrace the Roman Catholic faith, believing that, upon this foundation alone, the great superstructure of society can safely rest.†

What can be said in view of these facts? Does the study of history, the fine arts, mental and moral science, &c., lead to Romanism? So it would seem. Why not then commence a crusade against the historians, the artists, and the philosophers? Why does not the religious world prefer charges against them

* De Craux Lect. Pol. Economy.

† Adam Miller.

and convict them of heresy? To study history and the other sciences in the spirit of the Christian religion, as is evident from the examples here given, will doubtless lead to Catholicism, and if Protestantism fail to authenticate itself as the Catholic religion, the tendency must be to *Roman Catholicism*.

In most instances, however, within the last few years, the persons who have been converted to Romanism, or have been tending in that direction, have been influenced by their investigations of the great "Church Question" itself, or some subject intimately connected with it. As we are expressly taught by the creed, the essential characteristics of the Church are *unity, catholicity, holiness, and apostolicity*. This unity, it is conceived, must be external and visible, as well as internal and real; there must literally be one fold, as there is one shepherd; one faith and one baptism, as there is one Lord. The type of this unity is not sought so much in the harmony of the Church's confessions of faith, as in some central Church authority, and, not being able to find a visible bond of union in the Protestant Church, the serious inquirer, forgetting that the Reformation of the sixteenth century is of God, submits himself to the Church authority which has its centre in the pope of Rome.

The ideas of unity and catholicity are inseparable. The all animating power of the Christian Church is, like heaven, to pervade the whole lump of humanity, taking up and assimilating every part to the character of its glorious Head; all the relations of life, and also the arts, sciences, and literature are to be brought under the animating and sanctifying influence of the Gospel of peace. The serious student of the "Church Question," living perhaps in some section of the Protestant community where religion has degenerated into a mere morality, not being able to discern the true nature of Catholicity in the Protestant system, swings over, like Mr. Brownson, from the extreme of congregationalism to the extreme of popery. Where unity and Catholicity are wanting, *holiness*, the third essential characteristic of the Church, must be wanting likewise; her members are characterized by formality, worldly mindedness, and dishonesty. Then the devout and serious mind is naturally drawn towards the sanctuary which is distinguished by the sign of the cross, and where "Holiness" is inscribed upon the door posts, the walls, and upon the altar. Then the Holy Catholic Church cannot be of yesterday; her history must be traced to the time of the inspired Apostles, i. e., there must be a regular, unbroken Church succession from the time of the

Apostles down to the present time. The student of the "Church Question," not being able to trace the line of succession through the labyrinths of Protestantism, conscious that out of the Church there is no salvation, connects himself with the Church which bears the most evident marks of age. Here then we have before us the startling fact, that, in all such cases as are here described, Romanism is more successful in authenticating itself as the Catholic religion, than Protestantism.

What can be said in view of this humiliating fact? Shall we institute a judicial inquiry, and bring those great men, who have ventured to investigate the "Church Question," to merited punishment? This experiment has been tried and found wanting; no inquisition can arrest the growing evil; freedom of inquiry and liberty of thought must be tolerated. Shall we then, on the contrary, acknowledge that the claims of the Church of Rome are founded, and that the Protestant Church has no claim at all to the Christian name? Are Roman Catholics right and all Protestants wrong, in regard to the true nature and history of Christianity? Shall we desert the Protestant cause and "*en masse*" surrender ourselves to the great power that has opposed us? Shall we acknowledge that our Protestant religion is not Catholic, that it does not square at all with the idea of humanity as a whole, and that the wants of our religious nature can only be satisfied in the Church of Rome? To this it must come at last, if the mode of thought, which characterizes a great portion of the Protestant world at the present day, should ultimately prevail. This spiritualistic and outward mode of thought resolves all religion into a system (if system it can be called) of abstract notions and doctrines. The holy Bible itself is violently sundered from its living connection with the Church of Christ, and its contents measured by the contracted judgment of the single individual, without any regard to the united wisdom of the pious of past ages, or of the present time; the great doctrines of our holy religion are separated from the pillar and ground upon which alone they can safely rest, and every man is to be the infallible interpreter of them for himself, not being accountable to any power for his belief and practice, excepting the invisible authority of God alone.

It is never dreamed of indeed that God has revealed a power in the world, or that he has established a kingdom on earth to which the children of men are bound to submit. Though Christ once tabernacled in the flesh, he is now above the clouds,

"in the spirit land," and is in no sense present with the Church militant, except as God is every where present beholding the good and the evil. It is true, he has sent his Spirit into the world to convince men of sin, of righteousness, and a judgment to come, and to take up his abode in the hearts of his people; but the union between Christ and believers must not be regarded as vital and real by any means, but merely as moral. There must of course be worshipping assemblies, and ecclesiastical meetings. It may be well to have preachers, meeting houses, and occasionally, say twice a year, it may be well to administer the elements of the Lord's supper. All these things may serve as outward helps to devotion; but then the Church must not be regarded as grace-bearing by any means; the ministry must not be viewed as a divine institution, and, as to the sacrament of the supper, great care must be taken not to discern in it the Lord's body; that is up in heaven, and this is nothing more than a commemorative ordinance. Thus the whole of religion is resolved either into an *abstract spiritualism* or an *abstract formalism*; the two natures of Christ and his Church are effectually sundered, and thus the fact that the Son of God has come in the flesh is denied.

It requires but little penetration to see, that this mode of thought tends to undermine and disorganize entirely the Church of Christ as a divine institution. The Protestant religion, according to this view, is a baseless fabric; it is a mere negation; it is sliding sand, and furnishes no solid ground of faith and hope. It is not necessary to burden the pages of the Review with quotations from the writings of Pseudo-Protestants to show, that our judgment in regard to their mode of thought is correct. Every one knows, that the unchurchly and unsacramental religion of our day is decidedly the most popular amongst many Protestant denominations, whose confessions of faith are even amongst the *most churchly and the most sacramental*; whilst, amongst others, it is the most acceptable to favor the observance of Church forms and ceremonies. Abstract spiritualism has, perhaps, the truest representatives in the sect of the Quakers, as every one knows they make no account at all of a visible, historical Church, or forms of worship; even the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper are discarded. God is a spirit and they that worship him must worship in spirit and in truth; that is, the spirit of the worshipper must be brought into close and intimate fellowship with the Holy Ghost by a direct and immediate influence; so that no

means of grace can be of any value whatever ; every one worships and preaches "as he is *moved* by the Spirit."

Abstract formalism also seeks fellowship with God through the Spirit ; yet this cannot be obtained without the use of certain divinely prescribed forms. Our salvation is *conditioned* ; if, for example, the original form of Church government was the Episcopal, then all Christians must become Episcopalians in order to be saved ; if that form was the Presbyterian, then to be included in the covenant of grace we must all become Presbyterians. If immersion was the primitive mode of baptism, then all must be immersed ; if the sitting posture at the Lord's table was observed by the primitive disciples, then it is still the most pleasing in the sight of heaven to assume this attitude at the communion. Did Christ and the Apostles kneel in prayer, then should all Christians in every age of the world kneel to worship God acceptably. Those who observe these divinely prescribed forms may expect the Holy Ghost to be poured out upon them in copious effusions ; yet it is not conceived at all, that there is anything *saeramental* in these forms ; that is, there is no idea, that the grace of God is in any way bound up or united, with the ordinances of his appointment ; the connection between them and the spirit is entirely external, and not internal and necessary ; it is like that between a sand heap and the surrounding atmosphere. The spirit of religion and its form are not in living union ; but the one holds its place over against the other, leaning upon it at the same time for support. Were spiritualists consistent with their own notions, (we cannot say faith,) they must all join the Quaker sect ; but Quakerism, as is well known, is continually running out into infidelity ; therefore, it is thought safest and best to connect a few simple forms with religion, always keeping it before the people, that the spirit is one thing, and the form another. Thus precisely it was necessary for Gnosticism and Manicheism to lean upon one another for mutual support ; yet the one denying the humanity and the other the divinity of Christ, they could never bring the world to a consciousness of a saving relation to God ; and thus it is precisely with the two prevailing forms of error that afflict the Church at the present time, namely : *abstract spiritualism* and *abstract formalism*, the one making no account at all of the humanity of Christ, or the human side of religion, and the other denying the divine presence in a *real, living, and organic* form, can never satisfy the religious consciousness of man.

Here we have the very ground and reason of the "Romanizing tendencies" of the age. Let any one but examine the motives of the converts to Romanism, and he will discover that they all ground themselves in the fact, that, in their case at least, Protestantism has failed to authenticate itself as the catholic religion. And why is this? It is just because the temple of God has been so defaced, by its professed friends, as to make it impossible to recognize its true character; it is because all spiritualists and formalists fully corroborate the teachings of the Church of Rome in regard to the Protestant religion. Bishop Hughes, for example, preaches a sermon to show that Protestantism carries in it the principle of its own dissolution, and Dr. Berg, of Philadelphia, a distinguished Protestant polemic, corroborates the sermon by answering it with a mere rhetorical flourish, thus admitting that he has no positive arguments to offer.

Bishop Kendrick declares, that union of spirit without identity in faith is chimerical. "Union of charity," he says, "is a fond imagination of those, who would cover the shame of disunion by affecting to cherish what, at best, is but sympathy for the errors of their fellow-men. Truth is the essential characteristic of the Church, which is its pillar and ground; and unity can only exist in the common admission of truth in all its fullness. There cannot be *one Church* without unity of government, and this cannot be without a ruler. There can be no general or permanent order without a controlling power." This statement of the Roman Bishop is fully corroborated by all spiritualists and formalists, who acquiesce in the divided state of the Protestant Church, and who know of no life principle, which, in its development, will bring the scattered and bleeding fragments of the Saviour's body together, and present the Church to the view of man as a beautiful and organic whole.

What can be more chimerical than the idea that all believers can be *one*, according to the meaning of Christ, whilst they are divided into scores of denominations and sects, all occupying the same territory, and each one striving for the ascendancy over the rest? "Neither pray I for these alone; but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be *one*: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." This union for which the Saviour prays must be external and visible as well as spiritual, otherwise it could certainly not be an evidence to the world of his Messiahship.

The necessity of an actual and outward union is inculcated in all those scriptures which present to our view the idea of the Church. Everywhere in the New Testament is the Church spoken of as *one*. Are the members compared to the branches, then they are all pervaded and animated by the same spirit and life which are in Christ, the true vine. Is he the head of the Church, and are believers baptized into his mystical body, then it is asked, "Is Christ divided?" Is the Church compared to a temple, then it is one building in the Lord. Indeed there can be no scriptural truth more obvious than this, that the bond of Church union must be external and visible as well as internal and spiritual. All schemes of spiritual union, that do not look to a real outward union also are purely utopian and imaginary. Those persons, therefore, who ignore this truth, however pious they may affect to be, and however violent they may be against the Church of Rome, are actually on the side of the papists, who say that the Protestant Church is not *one* in fact and can never become one in reality.

Though these Pseudo-Protestants, (for we repeat that they cannot be Protestants in the sense of the Reformers,) may calumniate and abuse the papacy never so much, not standing on any positive Church ground, having no faith in the Church as such, all their opposition to Roman Catholics is just so much influence on their side. This influence has of late come to be very powerful and almost irresistible; there has been a general falling away from the true faith in the Church, which was so heartily professed by our pious forefathers, in the days of the Reformation. Those who have thus fallen away, according to their own reckoning, now comprise almost the whole of the "religious world." When the soundness of a churchly system of theology is to be tried and tested, it has come to be very common to say, that the judgment of the "whole religious, or evangelical world" is against it: i. e., the whole weight of this influence is brought to bear against all Protestant churchliness, thus giving the papists undisputed possession of the ark of the covenant. If as Protestants we have no Church consciousness, if we must continually ask, "Where is the Church, and where is the stream of her life," it is not a matter of surprise that we should see many persons tending in the direction of Rome. This explains the remarkable phenomenon, that in those very places, where this spurious Protestantism has its strongest representatives, the Church of Rome is most successful in gaining converts. She has always been the most suc-

cessful in building the largest cathedrals, and gathering the largest crowds of worshippers where she has had the assistance of such men as Drs. Breckenridge, Brownlee, and Berg. If these men had the spirit of a Luther, a Zuinglius, or a Calvin, it is doubtful whether there would, by this time, be a single papist in the city of Baltimore, New York, or Philadelphia; but having just the opposite spirit, the influence has just been in the opposite direction. These cities are now the strong holds of Romanism; and it is to be feared indeed, if the Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church should persist in its present purpose to lend its entire influence in the same direction, the whole State of New York, and those parts of New Jersey and Pennsylvania that belong to its jurisdiction, will before long become entirely Roman Catholic.

Inasmuch then as abstract spiritualism, as it is propagated by our so-called "evangelical Protestant world," to say nothing of its infidel character, tends to further the cause of Romanism, it cannot be expected, of course, that the abstract formalism of Protestants will be able to stand before this opposing power. It must be acknowledged, in all candor, that when we come to consider the human or formal side of the Church, we can scarcely find a single trace of unity or catholicity. It is impossible, from the stand point of the formalist, to maintain that the present divided state of the Protestant Church is a unity in the form of diversity. The many forms which the Protestant Church life has assumed, are not only DIVERSE, but they are different from, and opposed to, one another. What fellowship, for instance, can there be between Prelacy and Presbyterianism? What communion has old Lutheranism with Methodism? Where is the bond of union between the Baptists and the Moravians? These different forms of religion are all in open conflict with one another. Though each denomination and sect may, in its own way, have tested its form of Church government and worship by the word of God, it is evident that they cannot ALL exist by a divine right. This is impossible in the nature of things. They may all be wrong; but they cannot all be right. This fact is readily conceded by spiritualists; according to their view one form is as good as another, if it only serves to aid the cause of "spiritual piety." But with the formalist the case is entirely different. He maintains that the Church must have a divinely prescribed form, otherwise there can be no salvation. It follows, of course, from this mode of thought, that there cannot

be more than one right form of Church order and life. But here is just the difficulty. What denomination of Christians has this only right form? the Lutheran, the Presbyterian, the Episcopalian, or the Baptist? The last two named claim to be right to the exclusion of all others; but in their efforts to maintain their rights, they spend much of their force against one another, and when the ancient Church of Rome comes, and presents her long established claims, showing that she has still the identical form of government, doctrine, and worship, which she had in the beginning, the presumptive evidence appears at once to be in her favor.

To leave all other forms of Protestant Church life out of view, let us enquire, for the sake of illustration, whether the formalism of the Church of England can sustain itself, on the "jure divino" principle, in opposition to the imposing claims of Romanism. We select this particular type of Protestant formalism, because it is acknowledged by Roman Catholics that the Church of England bears more evident marks of unity and catholicity, than any other Protestant denomination. The Right Rev. J. Millner, in one of his letters to James Brown, Esq., uses the following language: "Perhaps, however, you will say, that the work of unity, which is wanting among the endless divisions of Protestants in general, may be found in the Church to which you belong, the established Church of England. I grant, dear sir, that your communion has better pretensions to this, and the other marks of the Church, than any other Protestant Society has. She is, as our controversial poet sings: 'The least *deformed* because *reformed* the least.'"

Now it is a remarkable fact, that all the evidence that can be adduced from history, in favor of the episcopacy of the English Church, is just so much evidence in favor of the episcopacy of the Roman Church. The advocates of English prelacy maintain, that the presumptive evidence is in their favor. In the Jewish Church there were three orders of ministers: the High Priest, the Priests and the Levites. In Christ's time there were three orders: Christ himself, the Apostles, and the seventy disciples; and after Christ's time we have three again: the Apostles, the elders or bishops, and the deacons. But if the prelacy of the established Church of England is to rest upon this evidence, may not the primacy of St. Peter and his successors be established by precisely the same evidence? If Christ took the place of the Old Testament High Priest, is it not quite natural to suppose, that upon leaving the world, he

would appoint a successor to take his place? Or, in other words, as Christ had taken into his own hands the keys of his kingdom, while on earth, why not place them into the hands of St. Peter, as he had promised, instead of distributing them amongst the Apostles generally?

The promise of the primacy was explained by the ancient Church fathers precisely as the Romanists interpret it at the present time; and as the Church of England professes just as much veneration for the fathers as the Church of Rome, their testimony in regard to the point at issue, must, of course, be relied upon as valid. The testimony of Tertullian on this subject is as follows: "Was anything concealed from Peter, who was styled the Rock on which the Church was to be built, who received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the power of loosing and binding in heaven and on earth?" Origen says: "Peter on whom the Church was built, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail, left one epistle which is generally admitted; for neither against the Rock on which Christ built his Church, nor against the Church shall the gates of hell prevail." Cyprian writes thus: "Our Lord, whose precepts and admonitions we ought to observe, establishing the honor of the bishop, and the order of his Church, speaks in the Gospel and says to Peter: 'I say to thee that thou art Peter and on this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: and to thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven.' Thence through the series of times and successions, the order of the bishops, and the Church flow on; so that the Church is established upon the bishops, and the very act of the Church is governed by the same prelates. Since then this is the case, I am surprised, that some, with audacious temerity, have ventured to write to me in the name of the Church, whilst the Church consists of the bishop, the clergy, and all the hearers." This quotation is peculiarly worthy of notice, not simply on account of the high standing of the author; but because he declares in the most unequivocal terms, that the whole Church is represented by one central Bishop. Frequently in his writings does he speak of Peter as the Rock on which the Church is built; "the representative of Episcopal power," "the organ of the Church, and the living personification of the principle of unity;" "There is one God, one Church, one chair, founded by the voice of the Lord upon Peter."

Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem; Basil the Great, Archbishop of Cesarea; Gregory of Nazianzum; Chrysostom; Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis; Cyril of Alexandria, and so on to the end of the chapter, all bear substantially the same testimony. All their evidence goes to substantiate the Roman Catholic view of Episcopacy, and not that of the Church of England. Yet whenever English Episcopalians argue in favor of their prelacy, and against our view of ministerial parity, they almost invariably adduce the testimony of the very fathers whom we have here named. All their testimony taken together *does* establish Episcopacy beyond the shadow of a doubt; but it happens to be the Episcopacy which has its centre in the Roman See. Have we not here, in all probability, the very reason why more great and earnest men have, of late, been converted to Romanism from the Church of England than from any other denomination? Why do they not stand firm upon the platform of the "Established Church," if it be really founded upon the Rock, Christ? They must of course have their doubts in regard to this, and fearing that the "establishment" may after all be only founded on King Henry VIII, they venture their all upon that ancient "establishment" which is acknowledgedly founded upon St. Peter.

This is not intended by any means as an argument against the Church of England as such, much less is it intended as an argument in favor of Romanism; but simply to illustrate the fact *which* every person ought to know, that no arguments conducted on an abstract principle can be of any avail in satisfying the religious consciousness of our nature; *no abstract systems of religion*, whether spiritual or formal, or both combined, can possibly authenticate themselves as the holy catholic religion, which squares fully with the idea of humanity as a whole. Consequently that entire body of Protestant systems, which are based only on abstract notions, principles or doctrines, however good and true they may be in themselves, setting itself up as the true Church of God in the world, shows its vulnerability and weakness at every point; it may parade its forces against those of the pope of Rome, and make a great show of superior strength; but all this is but the prelude to a disgraceful, yet a loving surrender to the opposing power.

But upon a still more minute examination of this subject, we shall discover that the "Romanizing tendencies" of the age do not only spring from a consciousness of the weaknesses and defects of Protestantism, as a system of abstractions; but also

from the fact that there is a natural affinity between Pseudo-Protestantism and Romanism. "Es ist nicht alles Gold was glänzet:" not everything is Protestant that goes by that name. The antichristian spirit that has so powerfully revealed itself in the Protestant Church, in the forms already specified, is not without a parentage; neither did it make its appearance on the stage of human action for the first time within the last century. Where this spirit originally came from we are not expressly told; but doubtless it came from beneath and not from above. St. John says that it was at work in the Church already in his day. Antichrist succeeded then already, some way or other, in securing for himself a seat in the temple of God, "exalting himself as God," continually trying to dethrone the king of Zion. Some honest persons maintain that the Church of Rome herself is antichrist, others contend that the pope is meant, whilst not a few of the learned argue that the Apostle describes the spirit which characterized the heretical sects, who denied that the son of God had come in the flesh. All will admit, we presume, the truth of the Apostle's statement, that every spirit that denies the central fact of the incarnation is antichrist, whether it be the spirit of the pope or of the sects. We presume also that it will be generally conceded that the history of antichrist is coeval with the history of the Christian Church; or, in other words, that the Church has always been obliged to contend with that wicked spirit, which, under an endless variety of forms, has denied the central mystery and fact of the Christian religion: and if Protestantism be the continuation of the ancient Church, as we have shown, it must be expected, of course, that it will have its antichrist. This will be the case as long as the Church continues in her militant state.

It is no doubt in view of the fact that the spirit of antichrist assumes an endless variety and diversity of forms, that the Apostle says, "*there are many antichrists.*" But no matter how great the number, and no matter how violently they may at times oppose one another, they all belong, as previously intimated, to the same family. Our Protestant antichrists are the regular descendants of the papal, or Roman antichrist; they are flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone; there is a communion of antichrists as well as a communion of saints. This being the case the antichristian spirit of *spiritualism* and *formalism*, which has gained such great power in the Protestant Church, will naturally seek fellowship and communion with its kindred spirit in the Church of Rome. What is the specific

difference between the abstract formalism of Pseudo-Protestants, and the grand and imposing formalism of the Romanists, except that the one is more subjective and the other more objective? May not the Protestant, who believes that his salvation is *conditioned* by certain forms, feel himself perfectly at home in the Church of Rome, where he may enjoy the free use of all the forms to which he was previously accustomed, and as many more as he may conceive to be necessary to satisfy all his religious wants? What can be more congenial to the feelings of such an one than the splendid ritualism and ceremonialism of the Roman Catholic Church? In view of this fact, the great wonder is, that there are not many more formalists leaving Protestantism and embracing Romanism than there really are; for where is the Protestant communion whose forms and ceremonies will bear a comparison with those of the Roman Church? The probable reason why there are not more persons visiting Rome to admire her beauty, and to participate in the solemnities of her worship, is because it is not quite popular. Let the tide of public opinion once turn in that direction, and it may be expected that the gates of the ancient city will be crowded with anxious converts.

Abstract spiritualism, as we said before, cannot hold its place in the temple of God, without the use of forms; it immediately runs itself out into bald infidelity, and thus showing the "cloven foot," it is at once unchurched. It, therefore, leans upon formalism for support; but where in Protestant Christendom can such ample help and support of this kind be found as in the Church of Rome? How can spiritual piety be materially aided with the few simple forms that are in use amongst Protestants? In many of the Churches there is no ritual at all; the worship is all "extemporaneous," there are simply exhibited now and then the emblems of our Saviour's broken body and shed blood. If it be necessary for the "pious" to use outward helps to devotion, why not go at once where these helps are abundant? Why not enter that magnificent cathedral where every object that meets the eye is commemorative of some great spiritual truth; where all the ceremonies have a tendency to elevate the mind above the things of time and sense, and to introduce it to the glorious realities and beauties of the temple of God in heaven? Did spiritualists but know the great advantages that might accrue to them from such a course, they would doubtless all soon leave the Protestant ranks, and enter the Roman Catholic communion; they

need not necessarily believe there, that the Son of God has come in the flesh ; they may make just as broad a chasm as they please between the human and divine sides of religion, and if the forms of public worship should not fully answer the purposes of "spiritual piety," this may, if it choose, perfect and complete itself in Monasticism. The proper home of abstract spiritualism and fanaticism is the cell, or the cloister. Who can tell the difference between the shouting fanatic and the monk ? The former, though he may be in the midst of a dense crowd, is as effectually separated from his fellow men as the latter ; there is no actual communion between him and his fellow worshippers ; if he were to listen to the sermon of the preacher or to the prayers of the congregation, he would "grow cold" in a single moment, and soon lose all the religion he ever had. His mind must be so entirely *abstracted* from every thing around him, as to have direct fellowship with the Spirit of God alone.

Thus we see how, in religion, as elsewhere, extremes meet ; that Pseudo-Protestants, whether spiritualists or formalists, need but change their name in order to become Romanists. Yet these are the very persons, who are continually raising the "hue and cry," "Romanizing tendencies," "beware of antichrist," whilst, if they were unmasked, they would themselves be the very personifications of the spirit of antichrist. Whether their mode of thought, or their principles literally lead them to Rome or not, matters but little ; their characters are the same ; and the reason doubtless of their present affected zeal for the orthodoxy of the Protestant Church is the very fact that there is now a mode of thought powerfully at work, which brings their true spirit and character to the light. The wicked and base design of undermining and destroying the fair temple of God has been discovered. The fact that there are antichrists at work in the Protestant Church can no longer be concealed. The tendencies of our refined spiritualism and formalism are coming to be understood : they go either directly to infidelity or to Romanism, and consequently to the destruction of Protestantism.

The only remedy for these evils, we repeat, is to be found in true churchliness. The hope that the Protestant Church will be able successfully to counteract and overcome all "Romanizing tendencies," depends upon her ability to throw off the diseases that afflicted her own body. She must be able to authenticate herself as the *Holy Catholic Church*, over against

the errors of Romanism on the one side, and all forms of infidelity on the other. Should she fail in this she must be given up entirely as a forlorn hope. It becomes a question, therefore, of great practical moment, whether Protestants have still faith in the Church as a divine supernatural fact; or, in other words, whether they still have the faith of the creed? Without this there can be no true Church consciousness, just as little as there can be any true Church life.

This faith cannot rest upon the evidence of sense, or report; neither can it spring from abstract theories or doctrines. Through the medium of the senses we hold communion with the natural world; but they have no power to raise us above the natural to the sphere of the supernatural and spiritual. The evidence of report is also of great value in the transactions of common life. Through this medium we become acquainted with many important facts and occurrences; but it must necessarily resolve itself into the evidence of sense; for it can only bring to us the news of what others have seen and heard before us. Science, theories, and doctrines are likewise of immense value and importance; and supernatural truths may become objects of science as well as natural; but our knowledge of them cannot originate faith: "*Neque enim quero intelligere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam.*" *He that believeth* "shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." Faith, being the gift of God, is the highest conceivable form of evidence. Hence, it is expressly said to be "the substance of things hoped for, the *evidence* of things not seen." Heb. 11: 1. It is the organ through which we take in the things of the supernatural world, the things which ear hath not heard nor eye seen. As it is written: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." 1 Cor. 2: 9.

Faith, having for its object the supernatural world, is something far higher than natural belief. It is the form of union and communion with the spiritual and eternal. The Church, therefore, as an article of faith, is included in the *mysteries* of religion, and can only be apprehended and understood in its living and necessary connection with the other articles of the creed. Indeed none of the great spiritual realities that are introduced to our notice in these articles can be at all apprehended as separate and isolated facts. Thus, for example, our Catechism says, in answer to the question, "What believest thou when thou sayest, I believe in God the Father Almighty,

maker of heaven and earth?," "That the eternal Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, (who of nothing made heaven and earth, with all that is in them, who likewise governs and upholds the same by his eternal counsel and providence) is for the sake of *Christ his Son*, my God and my Father." No one can believe in, or know God the Father, except through God the Son, as we are expressly told: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." John 14: 6. And as the first article of the creed can only be apprehended in its connection with the succeeding articles that ground themselves on the person of Christ, so the article of the Holy Ghost also springs from, and is conditioned by the fact of the incarnation. As the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, no one can say in truth, "I believe in the Holy Ghost," who denies the fact that the Son of God has come in the flesh. In this article of the third Person of the adorable Trinity are included all the articles that follow: "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." "The communion of saints," &c.

Thus the whole creed, with all its comprehensiveness and fulness, is actually *one*, all gathering itself up in the person of him, in whom dwelleth the fulness of the God-head bodily. The Church is the form in which the great realities and glorious mysteries of our holy Christian religion are actualized and perpetuated in the world. Hence it is called "the Church of the living God;" "the pillar and ground of the truth;" "the body of Christ, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Therefore, whosoever believeth in the Church as the form of the Saviour's life and presence in the world, also believes in *all* the articles of our undoubted Christian faith. He believes in *all* the mysteries of godliness. He has, in a word, the true religion, which can satisfy every conceivable want of his nature. His faith may be tried by the actual condition of the Church in the world. He may mourn over the desolations of Zion, and his mind may be greatly perplexed in view of the divisions in the body of Christ; but, conscious that he has been baptized into that mystical body by the Holy Ghost, and that he is under the influence of a plastic power, which is assimilating his character to that of the glorious Head of the Church, he is assured that by this same power all her divisions will be healed, and that, when her warfare is accomplished, she will be *one* in reality as she is one in idea, and that "she will be without spot or wrinkle or any such thing." Those Protestants

who have this faith can go neither to infidelity nor to Rome. How can those who enjoy the pure waters of life that flow from the Rock, Christ, and the manna that cometh from heaven, return to the muddy waters and to the flesh pots of Egypt? Those professing Protestants, on the other hand, who have not this faith, whose religion (if they have any religion at all) is entirely subjective, may forever thank their stars, if they do not, in the end, find themselves in a worse place than either Egypt or Rome.

M. K.

Reading, Pa.

VIII.—WANNER ON THE FAMILY.

THE FAMILY; OR MARRIAGE RELATION AND RELIGIOUS TRAINING OF CHILDREN. *By Rev. A. Wanner, Pastor of the German Reformed Church, in Washingtonville, Ohio, and vicinity. Chambersburg, Pa., M. Kieffer & Co., pp. 238.*

THE nature and responsibilities of the Marriage relation, as well as the duties which ordinarily arise out of it towards children, cannot be too fully understood nor too deeply impressed on the general mind. Much of what may be termed the miseries which sometimes attach to married life might be avoided, were those who enter into this state to do so, under correct views of its nature and a proper sense of its weighty responsibilities; and a vast amount too of the evils which result to individuals, to families and to society from the improper training of children, might be prevented, were the duties of parents towards their offspring properly understood and faithfully discharged. Everything, therefore, which is calculated to throw light on these important kindred topics, and to aid in preventing the evils to which we have referred, must receive a hearty welcome from all who wish well to the human race. In this view, the work, whose general title is announced above, we should think, must meet with a favorable reception.

We are not without works from able writers, treating on some of the topics embraced in the general subject discussed in this volume, which are of great value in their place. As far as our knowledge extends, however, there was still ample room for the introduction of just such a work as Mr. Wanner has given to the public; yea, more: the circumstances of society as they exist, to a great extent, at the present day, create an imperious necessity for it. We have here the

nature and responsibilities of one of the most important relations in society, as well as the relative and direct duties which necessarily arise out of it, presented in a comparatively short compass, and that in such a form and style as to make the work not only intelligible, but also highly acceptable to all, even to such as possess but a limited education, who are desirous of understanding the duties of their position, with a view to their faithful and successful performance.

The views taken of the nature and the responsibilities of the marriage relation are indeed elevated, and such as find comparatively little countenance at present in society; but they are still only such as are fully warranted by the word of God, and on this very account, it is the more important that they should come generally to prevail. There is a disposition also, in the midst of the radical and rationalistic tendencies of the age, to overlook the nature and undervalue the importance of Christian nurture, especially as this is included in the proper idea of what is technically termed educational religion; and hence the efforts of the author of the present work to place this subject in a proper and forcible light, must be regarded as truly seasonable and welcome.

The brief limits allowed us in this notice, will not permit us to enter fully into the merits of the important topics discussed in this work. For the satisfaction of our readers, however, we shall yet give a brief outline of its contents. The work includes two general divisions, the first treating of Marriage, and the second, of the Religious Training of Children. Under the first division, we have discussed such topics as the following: Marriage an institution of divine appointment; Intermarriages with the world forbidden in Scripture; Intermarriages with the world, sinful, and expose to the just judgments of God; United head of the family; Marriage relation designed to continue until death; Relative duties of husband and wife; The husband placed at the helm of the family; Concluding remarks. Under the second division, after some introductory remarks and a chapter devoted to the consideration of the importance of the subject, we have discussed the following topics: The religious training of children, the duty of their parents and not of others; Religious training of children and parental authority; The exercise of parental authority; Religion and the spiritual guardianship of parents over their children; Parents should dedicate their children to God in holy baptism; Religious nurture; Common school education; Religious influence from abroad; Catechisation of adults with a view of preparing them for Church membership; Parents should furnish their children with suitable reading matter; Miscellaneous topics and concluding remarks.

Chambersburg, Pa.

F.

ERRATA. Page 139, in the note, after "the exclusive reference of the 13th and 14th chapters of the Apocalypse," insert "to *seal* Rome."

Page 137, line 29 from top, read "unhistorical" for historical.

Page 139, line 29 from top, read "Christianity" for "Protestantism."

